

THE  
LEVIATHAN  
Found out:  
OR THE  
ANSWER

TO  
Mr. HOBBS'S *Leviathan*,  
In that which my  
Lord of CLARENDON  
hath past over.

---

By John *Whitehall* of the Inner-Temple,  
Barrester at Law.

---

Job 41. 33.  
*Upon Earth there is not his Like.*

---

LONDON:  
Printed by A. Godbid, and J. Playford, dwelling  
in Little-Britain, 1679.



92



To the Right Honourable  
HENRY AGE Lord  
FINCH, Baron of Daventry,  
Lord High Chancellor of England,  
and one of His Majesties  
most Honourable Privy Council.

*My Lord*

**T**HE Shunamite was  
*so great a Favourite to  
the Prophet Elisha,  
that he commanded his Servant  
to ask her if he should speak for  
her to the Captain of the Host.  
I not being so much the Favourite  
of any that hath familiar  
access to your Lordship, make a*

A 2 *bold*

## The Epistle

*bold address of this little private  
Piece to your Favour and Incou-  
ragement, without any Prolocu-  
tor or Master of Ceremonies to  
introduce it: presuming that  
your Lordship, the Captain of  
our Host, (who think it, except  
I be deceived, not only the Ho-  
nour, but incouragement of their  
Gown to follow you) would not  
reject the good Intentions, how  
defective soever, of one that hath  
had his Education for several  
Years in the Honourable Society  
of the Inner-Temple (which  
may truly with many other Wor-  
thies, boast you their Member)  
when your Lordship did then  
preside. But, my Lord, there*

## Dedicatory.

*is not only this in the matter : for if I have done ill, in addressing this to your Lordship against Mr. Hobbes his Leviathan ( in all things past over by your Noble Predecessor my Lord of Clarendon, as ridiculous in themselves and not worthy of his Pen, he intending as I suppose only to Answer his Civil Politics ) I may plead this a little in my excuse : First, That your Lordship accidentally gave me the incouragement of the undertaking, for that ( amongst other things I have had the happiness both in private and public to Learn of your Lordship ) once you Taught me as well*

## The Epistle

well as the rest of your numerous Auditors (when the present Lord Chief Justice of England was called to be Judge of the Common Pleas) that it was not only the duty of every good Man but of every wise Man to indeavour the support of the Government he was protected by. Whereupon, my Lord, I having (after many repeated Discourses and particularly of Learned and excellent Divines of the impiety of this Book) got a sight of it, and being as much surprised with the obliquity of it as the Queen of Sheba (may I make Sacred contraries my illustration) was  
with

## Dedicatory.

*with the Wisdom of Solomon:*  
I perceived that that which I heard was not half, that was true, either in respect of Mr. Hobbes his indeavours to supplant all true and faithful Subjection and also Property (both which as I apprehend ought to be equally Sacred in their bounds both to King and People for their mutual preservation) or in regard of his damnable Opinions concerning God and Religion mixt with a Mahometan indeavour, by ill words, to supplant the greatest part of Civil Learning: I thought I could not better imploy part of a very long Vacation, it now being more  
than

## The Epistle

*than usually seasonable to express my Affection to the Government I have so long lived peaceably under, then to make it manifest to the World (to prevent future mistakes in that matter) that under the name of Leviathan are couched the most horrid and execrable opinions that were ever suffered to see the light in any Christian Kingdom, and only fit to make one upon the holiday of the Hangman: and importing so many Errors and Blasphemies against God and the King, and so much tending to the extirpation of all sense of Religion out of the minds of Men (which is*  
the

## Dedicatory.

*the basis of Government ) that I thought the forementioned saying of your Lordship, which sharpened my undertaking, might in the second place a little intitle me to a submissive claim of your defence not only by your Eloquence but Power: especially you being, Sir, so great and high in the favour of your Great and Royal Master, and so much intrusted by him with the affairs of Church and State, both which, if I take right measures, have in times of danger approved you their friend: and no wonder, Sir, since your high and generous Education as well as Converse in great Affairs cannot*

## The Epistle

*but have Instructed you in the only and infallible Remedy against the inroads of the People their greatest danger (to wit) the keeping up and within the bulwarks of the Law; which I have seldom seen any Man (and hope I never shall) attempt a breach upon, but that he hath proved the rubbish of his intended ruins; and how it will at last fare with the Leviathan, Mr. Hobbes I know not, for I trust your Lordship when you have perused this little piece will say, There is not his like upon all the Earth. Which I shall without more (knowing how tedious prolixity is to your*  
Lord-



## Dedicatory.

*Lordship ) refer to your great  
Learning and Wisdom, and on-  
ly beg pardon for the adventure  
of the subscription and intitling  
my self,*

Your Lordships

Most constant and  
obedient servant

J. WHITEHALL.

THE

222

L

I

ff  
a  
P  
D  
n  
C  
o  
B  
f  
o  
h  
Y  
g  
g



THE  
 LEVIATHAN  
 FOUND OUT.

**M**onsters in Nature, usual productions of Excess or Defect of Matter, upon Festivals and Jollities are exposed to shew for the Pleasure of the Spectators and Gain of the Possessors. Monsters in Policy, usual Productions of Excess or Defect of Government (Tyranny or Anarchy) are in Times of Danger and Conspiracy to be exposed for the Pleasure of the Wise and Settled, and for the Benefit of those that are Unstable, and subject to embrace novel though erroneous Opinions. Examples of the first have been frequently produced, but the Year 1651 (a time when our Nation groaned under the Dissolution of all Ligaments of our ancient Government,

B

having

having nothing in it like the Sun-shine of Authority, save the Tyranny of the Sword) only produced such an Example of the latter, I mean Mr. *Hobbes's Leviathan*, as no Antiquity ever I believe saw, nor no Posterity when exposed will e're approve of; which I imagin will be the Delight of the Wise, and benefit of others, not obstinately bent upon Errors. Upon this conceit, and the rather in this juncture, have I undertaken Mr. *Hobbes* in his *Leviathan*, who I can compare to nothing better than the Title of his own Book, I mean the *Leviathan*, for *there is not his like upon the Earth*, *Job* 41. 33. And when I have done, I hope the greatest of his Scholars will not dare to say that I have wrong'd him in the Title of mine. Censure I expect, not only because there are many who think, the easiest advance of their own Wit is to depress others, whereby they may be taken into the Mouths of Buffoons, the Worlds *would-be-wits*, (who in defect of Learning and Sence draw regard by mouthing and noise) whereby they may be made ridiculous; but also in respect of the many apparent Objections against this Undertaking;

as first, that my Studies have been bent another way; secondly, my confidence to attack Mr. *Hobbes*, so great in reputation (why I know not) for Parts and Learning, that many of his detestable Errours and monstrous Opinions have been embraced, and are daily undertaken to be defended, not only by many that would seem witty in the World by discouraging and maintaining things, because not learned in their Catechisms, but likewise by those (I hope but few) that desire to retain the reputation of Wise and Prudent. Thirdly, that my Lord of *Clarendon*, so eminent in Parts and Wisdom, hath written in answer to Mr. *Hobbes* before; yet I hope no one will be so violent against me for this, (which I thought the greatest Objection against this Undertaking) when 'tis considered, upon the perusal of his Lordship's Work and mine, that I have intermeddled with nothing his Lordship thought worth his Answer, only that which his Lordship hath either wholly omitted, or mentioned as absurd, and so pass over: Besides, the great Intent of his Lordship, as I suppose, was to answer Mr. *Hobbes* in his Civil Politicks,

and erecting of Governments, which, as his Lordship hath shewn, are so full of contradictions in themselves, and inconsistencies to all manner of Method and Peace, in any Christian, or indeed Pagan Commonwealth, that 'tis not possible for me to say more, who have been so little conversant in things of that transcendent Nature, in which his Lordship hath testified to the world himself so great a Master, at the King's most happy Restoration. So then, to that which his Lordship pleased not to think worth his Answer, in Mr. *Hobbes* his *Leviathan*, I shall apply myself, taking the entire Sentences, which are not too tedious, or the true Sence (so far as he is intelligible) of such as be, with the addition of any thing that he shall explain himself in upon the same place. But if Mr. *Hobbes* hath in any place said that, which he in another remote contradicts, (as he hath often done) I hope no one will say, that his Heresies, Errors, or Blasphemies, ought to be spared, and not laid open to the world, for the sake of the contradiction, considering, that 'tis not necessary that every one that reads a Chapter or Sentence, and may receive the in-

infection naturally resulting from it, should read or consider that which is manifestly to the contrary, thereby to make him consider, and prepare him for an Antidote or Enquiry; and in things of this nature Mr. *Hobbes* is very frequent. And to give an instance of this, he page 268. denies absolutely the personal Existence of the Divinity of God the Son and Holy-Ghost, as I shall shew in its place, and yet p. 204. he calls the two second Persons *God the son* and *Holy-Ghost*. Now I hope no good Man will say, that the denying of the God-head of the second and third Person in the Blessed Trinity is therefore not to be exposed, and answered with such severity as is proper for such monstrous though old Opinions, because Mr. *Hobbes* in another place contradicts himself. Nay, I think the Fabrick of his Civil Politicks (which I suppose was the Drift of his Book) is founded upon things incompatible; for he saith, p. 88, 89. *That the People upon submission to their Prince, contract one with another to submit themselves to him, (and indeed all their properties, which is the labour of his Work) and cannot be obedient to any other without his permission; and that the*

Prince makes no Covenant with the People ; And yet p. 114, 174. he saith, That that Subjection lasteth no longer than his Power to protect himself and them, and then they are absolved, and may submit to any one else that can protect them ; forgetting the consult of the P<sup>r</sup>inces permission, which he spake of p. 88, 89. which permission be sure no People shall ever have from their Prince to desert him, and then how can the People be absolved from their contract, the Prince having made no covenant as he saith with them ? Which I leave any reasonable Man to judg of, whether it be not impossible. This Absurdity I believe Mr. *Hobbes* little thought of at the time of writing his Book, bending his Mind as I suppose to the establishing a new Government, to be then erected, and the advance of himself in it, when our King was murdered, and his Royal Son beaten from his Rights, whereby they were uncapable to protect us. I shall not stay upon this, but refer my Reader to my Lord of *Clarendon*, who hath I think, as to all Matters of this nature, made such a Creature of Mr. *Hobbes*, that I can think him capable of no other Name than *Leviathan*. Only let me observe, what



what Stuff this is, when search'd to the bottom, to ground any Government upon: First, it is to give the Property of the People to the Prince, (like a dear Son of *Sibthorpe* and *Manwaring*) which will make them not only weary of his Government, but also to endeavour to throw it off, that they may have something to call their own: And in case their Governour shall be imprisoned by a Popish Plot, or by any Invasion or Rebellion, though but for a Week, be made otherwise incapable to exercise his Authority, the Subjects are absolved (which nick'd with *Oliver Cromwel* then, and the Papists now) from their Allegiance: Which is so monstrous an Opinion, that 'tis only to say, That Subjects may desert their King or Governour when he hath most need of their Assistance; which is undoubtedly against all the Laws of Reason as well as Charity: For 'tis as if *Mr. Hobbes* should have said, That our obligation to our Benefactors lasted no longer than their power to do us good, and that we might desert them in their adversity, whose prosperity we reaped so much advantage from. And 'tis little less than to say, That a Son may desert

his Father, and is absolved from his Obedience, when his Father is fallen into poverty. This Doctrine (sly and Jesuitical) in short is to set the Prince against the People, and the People against their Prince, to the ruin of them both, in *English*, to the ruin of his native Country; for 'tis to decoy the Prince into the hatred of his Subjects, and to teach the Subjects to desert their Prince at their own will and pleasure, they only being left Judges when their Prince is incapable to protect; for be sure, as I said before, no Prince will ever say that he is incapable to protect, when he is sure thereupon to be deserted by his Subjects, and thereby made no Prince at all. This Doctrine makes Mr. *Hobbes's* learned train of Thoughts, mentioned p. 10. work wonderfully in me, viz. the *Crime*, the *Officer*, the *Prison*, the *Judge*, and the *Gallows*; for Mr. *Hobbes* could not but know, that it is the greatest Interest of a Prince to support the Property of his Subjects, that they might rejoyce in their subjection, and consequently desire to stand by him in his greatest Necessities, and redeem him by their Blood and Fortunes (as the People of *England* are now resolved)

resolved) from any unhappiness that might befall him, and thereby restore him and themselves into their mutual happiness. I think in this last matter I have been so far from wronging Mr. *Hobbes*, though I have not repeated his very words in several parts of his Book, that (tis plain) his particular pages make his opinion look much worse than any thing I have said. And I intend not to tie my self in every place to particular Repetitions, which would be too tedious; but I challenge any Man when I have done, to say either in this, or any subsequent matter, that I have wronged Mr. *Hobbes* in the least, (though I believe many will doubt whether the Positions be any *English* mans, they are so gross, till read in his Book) in that which I shall repeat of him in words or substance. And to lay more weight upon Mr. *Hobbes* than he hath laid upon himself, would be further to load the oppressed, and like laying Felony <sup>guilty</sup> to a Man's charge, that was really guilty of high Treason. And as I shall lay nothing falsely upon Mr. *Hobbes* intentionally; so shall I not quarrel with every thing in his Book; for there are many things which  
 shew

shew Mr. *Hobbes* a Man of tolerable parts, though little in it shews him a Man willing to converse and digest his notions, which would have freed him from the delivery I suppose, not only of so many gross, but supercilious Errors; besides, no Book was ever so false, but had some Truths and Orthodoxy in it, and that may be seen in the *Alcoran*, and the *Moss* Book. Neither shall I often quarrel with Mr. *Hobbes's* Book in things, the truth or falshood of which, are of no moment; but with his gross and dangerous Errors, or that which tends to support them. As for his *Liberty* and *Necessity*, I shall not ingage in, hearing tis fully answered by a Learned Bishop already, no more than with what my Lord of *Clarendon* hath been pleased to answer; and other Writings against Mr. *Hobbes's* *Leviathan* did I never hear of, or see so directly to fall in with Mr. *Hobbes*, page after page. He (p. 1.) calls Nature, *The Art whereby God hath made, and governs the World*. Here at first he is got into such a Rapture, that he hath lost his Reason: for how God can be said to make the World by the Art called *Nature*, is inconceivable; for that the Nature of things  
suppose

suppose the preexistence of those things in which Nature must exist, and indeed is nothing else but an Energy or force given to things at the Creation, for the acting of such thing, as they are adapted to; whether of Generation, or otherwise, and is subsequent to the thing made. And this Position of Mr. *Hobbes* is but another manner of saying, *That God did not make the world by the Word of his Power, but had some Instrument preexistent to work with*; which is his first attack upon the honour of his Maker.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 2. saith, *That what the Passions of a Man, as Fear, &c. are in himself, he may judge what are the Passions in another on the like occasion.* But certainly, common experience teacheth every considering Man the contrary: for who knows not that knows any thing of the difference of ~~the~~ Constitutions, That one fears, &c. that which another doth not, and that under the very same circumstances? For doth any Man think, that because he dares not get upon his Horse back, that therefore another dare not. This would be one way to lose him; but such inconveniencies I believe Mr. *Hobbes* never thought of, only ventured

tured the conceit, supposing himself infallible.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 3. saith, *That the appearance of the objects of sense to us is fancy, which is the same waking that dreaming;* and p. 5. saith, *That Imagination and Memory are but one thing, which for divers considerations hath divers Names.* These assertions I should not trouble my self to shew the unreasonableness of, no more than with his condemning all the Universities of Christendom, p. 4. with impropriety of Speech, grounded upon the position of *Aristotle*, (the greatest Natural Philosopher that ever the World produced) viz. *That Sense is caused by a Species resulting from the object*, and yet shews no reason for his contrary conceit. Whereas had Mr. Hobbes had any modesty, or so much learning in the Law, as in other places he pretends to, he would have thought it hard to explode an old opinion without a better reason, and would have known that a prior Possession is the best Title against all but him that hath right. This tends only to disparage the way of Learning, but I am afraid his saying that Sense is Fancy, and memory Imagination, strikes higher, and that

that thereby he intends to enervate the authority of the Scriptures, ( which he so much endeavours through his Book ) if not utterly to supplant them; which will make him the easier task hereafter to maintain, that only that is Canonical Scripture which is authorized by the civil Sovereign, as he affirms, p. 199, 205, &c. For the Argument lies thus; It must be agreed on all hands, that the things done and delivered to us in the Scriptures, were for the most part but the things they who deliver'd them saw and remembred; which is a great ground-work of the Scriptures Authority. Then, *hæc pifio* may Mr. Hobbes, and his Disciples say, If the Relators of the Scriptures only saw and remembred these things to be so, they only fancied them and imagined them; and what a Man phancies or imagins, may be, or may not be. But tis most plain, that seeing is one thing, and phancy another; memory one thing, and imagination another. As for instance, before I saw Mr. Hobbes's *Leviathan*, I fancied and imagined by what I heard, that it was an ill Book; but when I had seen and read it, and remembred the Contents of it, I was certain that it is

as

as full of contradictions, execrable, detestable, and damnable Opinions, as a Toad is of Poyson. So I hope it appears, that the Authority of the Scriptures is not lessened by this conceit of *Mr. Hobbes*, which in it self is contrary to sence; but that every good Man will think, that the Pen-men of them had a better certainty than phantasie and imagination.

*Mr. Hobbes*; p. 7. saith, *That Witches Witchcraft is not any real Power, but that they are justly punished for the false belief they have, that they can do such mischief joyned with their purpose to do it if they can.* I will not controvert with *Mr. Hobbes*, whether there have ever been Witches or no. Neither should I controvert with *Mr. Hobbes* the dueness of their punishment, which is death, and that only (as he saith) for belief they can, and their desire to do mischief; only in this he meddles a little with our profession of the Law, (and I could wish for ~~the~~ sport-sake he had dipt a little more into it than he hath in his Book.) But this let me tell *Mr. Hobbes*, that no Man ever was by our Law put to death for believing he could, and desiring to do mischief; for the case of high Treason goes farther than



than belief and desire; and Mr. *Hobbes* would think it hard else, especially in this case I shall put him, *viz.* when Mr. *Hobbes* only believed he could, and desired to write such a Book as the *Leviathan*, (which tended in the year 1651. to keep both Church and State subverted, or to resubvert them, if restored) had it been known, the Law of the Land would not have taken his life for it; but when his Book was published by him, and the mischief had spread it self, had the Law been unmuzzled, he would scarce have scaped with his life, except his Pocket or Legs had proved better than ever I perceived his Head. But why Mr. *Hobbes* should be so much against ill desires in this page, as to make them capital, when in *p.* 26. he denies any Iniquity to be in them, as I shall shew in its place, is not to be answered: save that Mr. *Hobbes* must be allowed to forget himself in the space of 19 pages.

Mr. *Hobbes* condemns the Schools in *p.* 8. and I will refer it to any reasonable Man, whether he condemn them for anything that is rational or sensible. And *p.* 10. he saith, *That the best Prophet naturally is the best Guesser.* I suppose he means

means the best natural Prophet, and so his ill methodised words may be true, but 'tis false to say (as I shall shew anon) that the Prophets of the Old and New Testament were only Gueßers, that is, only fancied and imagined what they wrote was true.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 11. saith, *That there is no Idea or Conception of any thing we call Infinite.* This he follows with a blaming the Philosophers and School-men, for saying there is, and indeed presseth this Position with a company of words, that are enough to make any Man's Head ~~to~~ run round, that is not used to Mr. *Hobbes's* Notions, that make often a great noise, and signifie nothing, which will appear fully in this Paragraph: Where he confesseth a God, but denies us any (in effect) conception of him, (and p. 16. he saith, *That Infinite is a Negative word.*) So there's an end, if Mr. *Hobbes* say true of praying to, and worshipping God; for what we can have no Conception of, we can never Worship; for such a thing is nothing as to the worshipper, and consequently cannot be worshipped, nothing being incapable to be passive. 'Tis true, we cannot conceive the infinity  
of

of God terminatively, that is, the extent of it, which are terms contradictory; but we may conceive a God or Being that is infinite, that is to say, a God that can do or doth know every thing, and is not bounded or stopt by any particular, so that he can go no farther; but we cannot know how far that Power or Knowledge doth extend. This Position Mr. *Hobbes* grounds much upon a former Notion of his, which one would not easily think he would have made such a wicked and unreasonable use of, (*viz.*) *That whatever we conceive, hath been first perceived by sense.* Which Tenet is very plausible and true as to our reasonings from matter of Fact, whereby we create in our selves deductions appertaining to Sense and Reason, and the government of our Conversations with Men and things that we can definitively know; but what is this to things above definitive Knowledge? For what we cannot definitively know, is not the object of Sense, and yet we may conceive there may be something done or known that we cannot do or know, and a power or knowledge capable to do and know, as far as 'tis possible for any thing to be done or known, though we know

C

not

not the extent of the Capacity either of the Agent or Patient, and this we call infinite Power and Knowledge. I think Mr. *Hobbes* in this Paragraph is setting up the *Athenians* unknown god, which they ignorantly worshipp'd, but St. *Paul* declared him unto them, and I have so good an opinion of St. *Paul* that he would declare nothing but what was conceivable; nay Mr. *Hobbes* himself in his 12 page approves very well of the word Infinitive ( though he buggards at the word Entity ) as useful; but I would know of any rational Man of what use the word Infinitive is, if we can conceive nothing by it; for if we cannot conceive infinite, or a thing that is infinite, what do we do with the word infinitive, that signifies something not bounded, that is infinite. And now I am upon his condemning the word *Entity*, which he saith as well as *Intentionality* and *Quiddity* are insignificant words of the School, p. 12. Because I see Mr. *Hobbes* hath no infinite capacity, I will tell him the best I can, that Metaphysics may not be quite exploded by arrogant Ignorance, what is meant by Entity and Quiddity; and as for Intentionality I do not remember

ber it to be a word used in Philosophy, it being near 20 years since I left *Oxford*, or read any thing of that kind ; but as to Entity (much the same with Quid-dity ) 'tis a word to express our conceptions by of the nature of any thing, though no such thing was in being. As a Man may conceive the nature of a Dog under such shapes and qualities, though there was no such creature ; and the general Answer for this upon the question Quid-dity is Entity, the particular Canicity. And further to illustrate it, we may conceive a Man of an Opinion that there are no such persons in the Godhead as God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost ; or of an Opinion that all the World past and present were fools and mistaken, and that he only could give just measures to Words and Learning , and subvert all things, though in reality there was no such Person ; and this the Schools would call Atheisteity , Arroganteity. And if Mr. *Hobbes* or any one else should conceive a new *Leviathan*, before 'tis made, the Schools would call it *Leviathanicity*, and after Mr. *Hobbes* his death *Hobbeity* : but 'tis not good for Mr. *Hobbes* to write such an other Book, lest the Lawyers,

C 2                      though

though they be so ignorant as he saith they be, *p.* 50. be ready with a Penalty, and the Kings Majesty ( who hath suffered so much by Mr. *Hobbes's* first Book ) be not so ready with a Pardoneity, which on such an occasion I believe Mr. *Hobbes* would own as an Entity, though told him by a Schoolman, and that a material Entity.

Mr. *Hobbes*, *p.* 19. saith, *That the words a Free Subject are words without meaning,* and this he saith in his Chapter of *Reason*, where one would not expect such Nonsense ( only 'tis an Abridgement of his Doctrine tending to set Prince and People together by the Ears ). For, I say, *I am a Free Subject*, and 'tis as good sense as ever Mr. *Hobbes* spoke in his Life. For I am a Subject of the Kings, and free, I bless God, to enjoy my Property and Liberty according to the Laws of my Native Country. And observe, that the *Egyptians*, nor their Lands, were not *Pharaohs* before *Joseph* bought them for *Pharaoh*.

Mr. *Hobbes*, *p.* 20. quarrels at any ones saying, *That Faith ( and Sanctity, p. 169. ) are infused or inspired*; for saith he, *Nothing but Body can be breathed into any thing.* This is I think rather better Divinity

vinity than Philosophy. For in Divinity it may be true, *quoad hunc*, (*viz.*) that Mr. *Hobbes* had never any Faith or Sanctity infused into him, especially considering that he denies the existence of the Person of the blessed Spirit in another place. But I would know, if Faith cannot be infused, and if any Man be admitted by Mr. *Hobbes* to have Faith, how he came by it; certainly not as Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 169. *By education or external helps*, for we see many virtuously brought up, void not only of Faith but common Civility: Nay Mr. *Hobbes* so far in that p. 169. contradicts himself, as to say, *That God by outward means worketh them in his Elect*. So God is the infuser though he work by means, and the 2 Cor. 3. v. 5. is an express Text, *That we are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing, but our sufficiency is of God*. Now if we cannot think, how should we believe, but that Grace is given us of God of whom is our sufficiency. And the 2 Cor. 12. v. 9. Gods grace is said to be sufficient for St. *Paul*; if it be God's grace how came St. *Paul* by it, except it be infused? And *Luke* 17.5. The Apostles prayed for the Increase of their

Faith, which must be by Infusion increased, or no way that I can imagin; and 'tis plain the Apostles expected the increase of it not by Education or other External helps. But Mr. *Hobbes* his Philosophy in this place never can be true, for a Body can never be breathed into a Body, for that would be to make two Bodies in the same place, which Mr. *Hobbes* disallows. This is much like him in the next page, where he calls the words *Transubstantiate*, *Consubstantiate*, *Hypostatical*, the canting of Schoolmen, and words that signifie nothing; and p. 22. his calling Metaphors *ignes fatui*, and their end Sedition, and all this without any colour of Reason; although Metaphors are so frequently used in Scripture, as *Abraham* calls himself *Dust and Ashes*, and *Abraham* never rebelled against God his King ( as Mr. *Hobbes* elsewhere styles God to be ). And Saint *Paul* calls himself *the Prisoner of Jesus Christ*; and Mr. *Hobbes* in his Book often uses Metaphors, which I will allow him if they be like the rest, and do tend to Rebellion.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 24. *That there is nothing simply or absolutely Good, but as Men*  
account



*account things so to themselves, or as they are made so by the Person representing the Common Wealth, or by an Umpire.* This is the best part of Mr. Hobbes his Divinity. But I would know of Mr. Hobbes, whether there was any such thing as a Law to the Children of *Israel*, or other people, before the Decalogue. If *Cain* had lain with his Mother, there being no positive Law to prohibit it at that time, that we know of, had it been no sin? Or how came the Heathen to be a Law unto themselves, 2 *Rom.* 14. when they had not the express Law or Decalogue, except there is something Good or Evil of it self simply and absolutely? For a Law supposeth a transgression, and in this place it must be intended the Law of Nature, for they had it in themselves, which only can reflect upon what is Good or Evil by Nature, that is simply Good or Evil. This Doctrine is as dangerous as false, for it tends to encourage Men inclinable to be vitious in several wicked Desires, Words or Actions, which they find the Law of the Land doth not extend to punish, nor the Scriptures plainly or expressly forbid. And Mr. Hobbes might have remembered that

there is such a thing as unnatural Lust ( that is Lust against the Law of Nature ) spoken of in Scripture. But this is as true as his calling in the next page sudden Courage, Anger.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 26. *That the desire of Riches in it self is to be blamed or allowed, according to the means by which those Riches are sought.* And p. 151. he hath a Tract much to the same purpose, And p. 62, saith, *That desire and other passions of Man are in themselves no sin.* Mr *Hobbes* but two pages off was against any sin, till there was a positive Law ; now he is for making Covetousness no sin though it be by a positive Law made so ( viz. ) the tenth Commandement, ( as other passions are forbidden by other Commands ) which saith expressly, *Thou shalt not covet what is thy Neighbours.* Now the desire of Riches saith Mr. *Hobbes* is not the sin but the means by which they are sought. So the sin, as he saith, only lies in the act of acquiring, not in the desire which the tenth Commandement expressly contradicts. As if he should have said, if you pick not your Neighbours pocket you may desire his Money. If you cut not the Husbands throat you may lust after his  
his

his Wife; nay for ought I know he may intend, that you may actually lie with her, if you do it not by force or fraud. (Though Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 179. *That not only unjust facts but intentions are injustice.*) These Positions of Mr. *Hobbes's* against sins of desire and other passions, makes an end of all sin of thought, though *Rom. 2. 1, 2.* be a Text expressely, as I think, to the contrary, and though our Saviour elsewhere saith expressely, *That he that looks upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed Adultery with her in his Heart, Matth. 5. 28.* But to this Mr. *Hobbes* may perchance say, *That heart-Adultery is no sin.* And 'tis no matter what he saith in matters of Religion, when to bring Religion it self into contempt, defines it, (*viz.*) *A Fear of Power invisible, feigned by the Mind, or imagined from Tales publicly allowed; not allowed, Superstition; and when the Power imagined is truly such as we imagin, true Religion.* And with this he accords, p. 51. So that Mr. *Hobbes* in other words calls Religion (which is the Apprehension in a good Christians mind of his duty to serve the great God, and his hearty performance of the same,) first, only a fear, no love in the case. And  
secondly,

secondly, of a Power invisible, let it be of God or the Devil. Thirdly, this fear saith he is fained by the mind (which excludes reality) or imagin'd from Tales publicly allowed, that is, stories people generally believe, no matter whether true or false, and when the Tales are not approved of 'tis no Religion, as he saith, but Superstition; and when the Power we fancy or imagin is truly such as we imagin it, then 'tis true Religion. So if the *Indians* by Mr. *Hobbes* his rule fancy the Devil is able to do them hurt, then theirs is true Religion. Well done Mr. *Hobbes*, for he hath made Religion in general much like his own, and that except I be deceived is none at all, and this without vouchsafing a Reason of such an idle conceit. And let Mr. *Hobbes* say what he can, or any one for him, this Paragraph tends only to draw wicked or unwary Readers into contempt of Religion, and to make a mockery of it; which must tend to their Eternal misery, and to keep them from that beatifical vision which Mr. *Hobbes* page 30. without Sence or Reason calls a word of the Schoolmen, and unintelligible.

Mr.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 32. saith, *That when we believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, we believe the Church or a Prophet, ( except some immediate revelation intervene, ) so far as 'tis possible to know what he means.* He saith, *That if we believe not the Scriptures, the affront is done to the Church or a Prophet, and not to God, as the not believing the Stories of Livy concerning the gods, the affront is done to Livy and not to the gods.* This is to undermine the Scriptures before he comes to blow them up. But let Mr. Hobbes look the 5<sup>th</sup> of Ephes. and he shall find, that the Church hath handed down the Scriptures to us so united to Christ, and the Union so firm there expressed between Christ and the Church, that he must needs conclude, that any affront done to the Scriptures must necessarily be done to Christ and to God. And I do affirm against all the conceited Irreligionists in the World, that the Scriptures would have been the Word of God, and the Rules of Salvation, although our blessed Saviour had not appointed any Church to have handed them down to us; not that I say every cavilling Atheist would have assented to them. But then as Mr. Hobbes plentifully

ly urges in his Book, *How shall we know that they are the Word of God?* And of this I shall say something more hereafter. But at present, say, that I think 'tis sufficiently satisfactory to any rational Christian, that they are the Word of God, because they teach us our misery by sin, to which our mortality is so subject, our Redemption by Christ, and appoint us a Pious and Virtuous way of living here, and the way to an happy immortality hereafter. Besides, what rational Man can suppose, that the good and wise God would leave mankind without a guide to a blessed immortality, and what guide is there like this? So that any Man that is not frantick or resolved to quarrel with every thing other people assent to, but must say, that God is the Author of them, and consequently the disbelief of them is an affront done to God if we deny them, and not to Man only. And I think good King *Josiah* and all *Judah* with him believed the Law to be the Word of God, and thought the contrary would be an affront to God, upon less or at least upon less inviting grounds, *2 Kings* 21. than we ought now to believe the volume of the Bible to be so. But if we believe

believe not the Fables of *Livy* concerning the gods, the affront is only done to *Livy* and not to his gods, for they were no gods at all; and so Mr. *Hobbes's* Example is at best but a fallacy, which he is very frequent in; and I have so much charity for him as to believe, that 'tis not always out of design, but sometimes caused by his want of a clear Judgement; for Mr. *Hobbes* cannot but know, that a juggling Cock is often hit.

Mr. *Hobbes* after a long discourse of the passions, the absurdity of which is not worth the answering, p. 38. saith, *That the Scriptures, by the Spirit of God in Man, mean a Mans Spirit inclined to godliness.* And for this he cites *Exod.* 28.3. which is nothing to his purpose, though not so much against him as other Texts are. As 31. *Exod.* 3. which saith expressly, *I have fill'd him with the Spirit of God, to work;* which as Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *Is Mans Spirit inclined to godliness.* And the 51. *Psal.* 11, 12. where *David* prays, *That God's Spirit may not be taken from him, but that he may be upheld by it;* is as Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *David's own Spirit;* without doubt *David* thought it God's Spirit,

Spirit, or he would have called it by an other name; and I believe *David* knew as well as *Mr. Hobbes* how to express himself. So to make this Opinion sufficiently ridiculous, look *Judges 15. 14.* where 'tis said, *The Spirit of the Lord came mightily on Samson, and the cords brake, and he kill'd the Philistines*; that is saith *Mr. Hobbes*, *Samson's Spirit was inclined to godliness*. And from hence *Mr. Hobbes* may raise this Observation, *That a mans godliness makes him able to pull cords asunder*, which perchance *Mr. Hobbes* trusted to when he wrote his *Leviathan*.

*Mr. Hobbes* saith, p. 38. 39. *That all those that our Saviour is said to cast Devils out of were nothing but mad Men*. And I will deal plainly with *Mr. Hobbes* and tell him, that none but mad Men think so. For was he only mad that was torn by the evil Spirit before he came out of the Man possessed? Or were they only mad that were possessed by the Devils, 8. *Matth. 31.* when the Devils spake, and after Christ permitted them to go into the herd of Swine, and why ran the herd of Swine thereupon into the Sea? To this *Mr. Hobbes* may say, That they



they were mad Swine to do so. And in the 12. of *Matth.* 27. our Saviour saith, *If I by Beelzebub cast out Devils, by whom do your children cast them out?* Here 'tis agreed, both by our Saviour and the unbelieving Jews, that our Saviour did cast out Devils, therefore the Men were something else besides mad, out of whom Devils were cast. And why Mr. *Hobbes* should be wiser, or undertake to be so, than either the Jews or our blessed Lord and Saviour, is an hard matter to know, except it be that after his labour to bring Religion and the Scriptures into contempt, now thinks by a side wind to debase our Saviour in his Miracles, ( whereof one of the most eminent was his casting out Devils ) before he strike at his Godhead.

Mr. *Hobbes* in his tenth Chapter hath much to do with Power and Honour, and saith, *That good success is Power*, p.41. and *to flatter is to Honour*, p. 42. and *that an action whether just or unjust, if great and difficult, is Honourable*, p.44,45. Of which last I will give an Example, If two high-way Men rob six honest Men, or a Russian ravish a Woman of great Quality, 'tis Honourable. And this I have  
Mr.

Mr. *Hobbes's* warrant for. But in short I repeated these last sentences to shew his vain humor.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 50. *That Ignorance of the causes of Justice disposeth a Man to make custom and example the rule of his actions, and to judge that just or unjust of the punishment or example of which they can produce an example; or ( as the Lawyers, which only use this false measure of Justice, call it ) a precedent.* Thus far he. I thank Mr. *Hobbes* that whilst he is condemning the vices of the Lawyers argues us possessors of one virtue, and that is modesty in regarding what was said or done by others before; which had Mr. *Hobbes* had the least share of, I think he would never have put forth his *Leviathan*; and we ought to thank him for affording us so good company in our sufferings of ill Language, as Religion in general, and our blessed Lord and Saviour in particular; yet see the charity of the Lawyers since to Mr. *Hobbes* in being mainly instrumental in the Act of Oblivion, which Mr. *Hobbes*, will call just, because as to him 'twas without precedent. But Mr. *Hobbes*, as in many other places, makes himself the sole authority

thority in this matter; for why the word *Precedent* is so Barbarous a word, for what hath been done in matters of Justice I know not; for *pracedo* is to go before. But to tell Mr. *Hobbes* what use the Lawyers make of a precedent ( or as some call it a president ) is not to be better done than putting his own Case: as suppose Mr. *Hobbes* was now to be arraigned for his Book ( and that no Pardon had intervened ) so full of blasphemous Opinions against God, the King, and his People. The Judges would look to see the punishment of such a precedent Malefactor, the better to direct themselves in such a Case, and if they could find no such Malefactor ( it being impossible as I think ) then they would judge what was the Law and punishment due in such a Case: Not that they would condemn Mr. *Hobbes*, could they find a precedent, because of that precedent, but they would first examine whether that precedent was agreeable to the Law of this Nation, and in case it was they would proceed accordingly, and in case it was not, would reject it and judge the Law without it. Where is then the false measure of justice

making use of a precedent? I think no one will say there is any, except he have a design, like Mr. *Hobbes*, to ruin the Law by making it odious, and thereby open a gap for a standing Army; which in probability would ruin both Prince and People: to the security of both which the Law is so main a bulwark.

Mr. *Hobbes*, in his Chapter of *Religion*, amongst a company ( I hope the word is not Barbarous ) of Notions, which only I suppose have sprung from his own whimsical Fancy, hath p. 54. this Paragraph, *In opinion of Ghosts, ignorance of second causes, devotion towards what Men fear, and taking of things casual for Prognostics, consisteth the natural seed of Religion; which hath according to the difference of passions grown into different Ceremonies.* Now I absolutely deny, That the seed of Religion consisteth in any of these: But the first seeds of Religion were first sown in *Adam* by the Knowledge of the great God, who made him and all the World; and was capable to punish or destroy him and the rest of the World, as well as to bless, when it should be his good will and pleasure, and

and from thence, together with his favours received, sprang the reasonable deduction or consequence in *Adam* ( which was communicated to his posterity ) that it was his duty to serve, and please his Creator, that was capable at pleasure to destroy, or preserve him. Secondly, The seeds of Religion are in every Man either from this Ancestral relation, or else from the very sense of mankind of a Power and Goodness above them; which is naturally implanted in them, as all other faculties are, that are natural; which begets in all mankind a Veneration towards that Power and Goodness; and this is it, conjoyned with works, we call Religion. But the opinion of Ghosts, ignorance of second causes, Devotion to what Men fear and other casualties, are subsequent in the minds of Men to this natural seed of Religion, and are rather the Suckers than Seeds of Religion: But I confess that from these seeds many several ways of Worshipping this God through Mens ignorance, have been set up in the World. Mr. *Hobbes*, I suppose by this conceit of making Ghosts and Ignorance, that is Fancy and Mistake

the seeds of Religion, thought he could the more easily prepare Men to be of any Religion or none, according to the subsequent humor of Mr. *Hobbes's* civil Sovereign. For why should People stickle for that whose ground is Fancy and Mistake? And Mr. *Hobbes* may make the natural seeds of Religion to be what he pleaseth, since in this Chapter, p. 61. 62, 63. he makes the effects of those natural seeds none at all. For he saith, *All Men by nature ( till under a Governor ) may do what they can each to others persons (as particularly in p. 64. ) or goods; being in an estate of war by nature each against other.* This is the substance of most of those leaves and particularly he saith, p. 63. *That the notions of Right and Wrong, Justice and Injustice, have there no place; and where there is no common Power there is no Law; no Injustice. Force and Fraud are in War the two cardinal Virtues; Justice and Injustice are none of the faculties either of Body or Mind; if they were, they might be in a Man though but one in the world.* With much such stuff as this is, although to do him right, he so far contradicts himself, p. 185. as to say, *That Conscience ought*

*to govern where there is no Commonwealth.*  
 I thank Mr. Hobbes for instructing me in two cardinal Virtues, I never heard of before (*viz.*) *Force and Fraud*; which are two precedents the Lawyers (though so guilty as Mr. Hobbes saith, *of false measures of Justice*) never make use of. But let us observe what turns upon these excellent hinges. First, That a Man may by nature do that to another that he would not have another do to him. He may take his Neighbours goods or life by deceit or violence, though he would not have an other take his; for would any Man have an other take his goods or life by fraud or violence? 'Tis impossible to humane nature to suppose it. Secondly, Observe that *Cain's* killing *Abel* was lawful; and that *Oliver's* Army might in the Year 1651. take all the propriety of the people of *England*, as they had taken the King's; all Subjects according to Mr. Hobbes Positions, being absolved from their Allegiance, and so were return'd into an estate of Civil War, each with other; there being no Governor at that time in *England* set up, except the Army. This makes me think what a good Trade a

Captain of Horse of the same Faith with Mr. *Hobbes* might have had at that time; and what a lawful calling a Highway Man was then of, and how much he might have deserved with a true Son of Mr. *Hobbes's* as an Apprentice. This, I suppose, was written to satisfy the Consciences of those Men that enjoyed most that they had at that time got by Force and Fraud; and I wonder they did not make Mr. *Hobbes*, for his healing Divinity, a Superintendent of *Canterbury*, with the power of a Troop of Horse to get as many other inferiour Ecclesiastical Lands into his Hands, as he could by force; or that they did not give Mr. *Hobbes* a Patent under the broad Seal of the Sword to cheat all he could for seven Years. But, I suppose, the Souldiery then thought it no sin to cheat Mr. *Hobbes* of his due reward, since by his own Doctrine it was Lawful for them to cheat all they could; and there Mr. *Hobbes* was catcht. But in this Chapter I perceive in Mr. *Hobbes* one virtue, that I seldom observe of him elsewhere, and that is that in this Chapter he agrees in substance with himself in the precedent; and that is in making  
natu-



natural Religion a meer Fancy, and a thing that can give no check to the natural vitious inclinations of Men, but that by Nature they may do what they please, according to his Position, *That Justice is none of the faculties of the Mind.* 'Tis strange a wise God should create the rational Creature, Man, and not give him one of the best effects of reason, (*viz.*) Justice, and a thing which tends so much to his own preservation; nay that Man should be created in the Image of God, and yet be wholly so unlike him in one of his great Attributes. And let Mr. *Hobbes* say what he will to the contrary, a Man may be unjust to himself, though there was no more Men in the World. As if *Adam* had cut off one of his limbs in Paradise, it had been injustice to himself, being unnatural, that is, against the Law of Nature. But how come the Gentiles, that have not the Law, and by Nature do the things contained in the Law, *Rom. 2. 14. to be a Law unto themselves*; if there be nothing in a Man's nature to restrain him from injustice? And if it was not justice the Heathens natural Law was conversant about, what was it? For

twas that which was contained in the Law, which is the Decalogue, both parts of which relate wholly to justice, either to be done to God or our Neighbour. But to conclude, The Positions in this his Chapter are much like the rest of his Book, that is, little but the empty speculations of his own irreligious Heart and shallow Head.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 64. saith, *That Law and Right are inconsistent in the same matter.* Certainly he said this, when he was not in his right Reason; for nothing is more apparent, that Right is worth nothing, except there be Law to recover it, and therefore they must go together; and in having of Law to recover Men's rights, lies the grand foundation of peace, which is the greatest worldly happiness of mankind; and so are clearly consistent in the same matter.

Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 69, 89. *That to make a Covenant with God is impossible, but by mediation of some one which God immediately speaks to, or by the civil Sovereign, for else we know not that our Covenants are accepted.* Mr. Hobbes I perceive by this is very willing to renounce

nounce his Baptisme, and to say, *That his Covenant by his Parents or Godfathers, to renounce the Devil and the Word, signifies nothing*; yet I perceive he renounceth not his Name of *Thomas*. And I also see that *Mr. Hobbes* is willing to free himself of all Covenants of better obedience at his coming to the Lord's Table. But let him say what he will, it is the duty of every good Man to make Promises or Covenants of Obedience to God, and to perform them too; as every good Man doth at his coming to the Sacrament: and 'tis impossible to interest the civil Sovereign in all matters of that kind. 'Tis true that the *Israelites* made a Covenant with God, by the mediation of *Moses*, but follows it therefore that no private Man can covenant with God without interesting the King as to the matters of his own Soul? 'Tis nonsense to say so, and nothing but the trick of giddy headed People to say, that because a thing hath been once on this manner, that therefore it can never be otherwise.

*Mr. Hobbes* saith, p. 71. *That an Oath adds nothing to the obligation.* That is to say in the Year 1651. when people, according

cording to Mr. *Hobbes's* Positions, were  
 absolved from their Allegiance, they  
 ought not to regard the Oath which  
 they had taken for it; whereby no scruple  
 might be left upon any Man's Con-  
 science in respect of his Oath to adhere  
 to the King, or to act against him. But  
 certainly all wise Men, and that in several  
 ages, have thought, and do think,  
 that our obligation to our Prince, or any  
 obligation made each with other, is  
 stronger by an oath, as to oblige the  
 Conscience, which guides every good  
 Man, and the more unquestionably will  
 be performed. And for that let any one  
 look the 6th of the *Hebrews* 16, 17, 18. v.  
 and he will be satisfied that an Oath  
 adds to the obligation; and wherein 'tis  
 particularly said, *That God confirmed his  
 promise by an oath*: and certainly if the  
 obligation was confirmed by God's oath,  
 the oath added something to it in re-  
 spect of God or Man: And if an oath  
 add nothing, why did *David* swear, and  
 say, *He would perform*? But this pretty  
 Position of Mr. *Hobbes* in 1651. was to  
 adapt the people for a new government,  
 and 'tis very like that he was too fond  
 of the notion to examin the truth of it.

Mr.

Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 71. *That the Definition of Injustice is no other than the not performance of covenant.* If he had said, that the breach of all lawful covenants had been unjust, he had spoken truth. But there may be injustice without any covenant, and that even by the Law of Nature, as I have said before, and so I shall pass it over. And though Mr. Hobbes saith in this page, *That before the breach of covenant can be unjust, there must be some coercive power, to compel Men equally to perform their covenants.* I absolutely deny it: For first, if a Man covenant though never so privately, and no witness present; yet he is bound to perform what he covenants to do, or else he breaks the Law of Nature in doing that to others, which he would not have others do to him. Secondly, David saith in his 15. Psal. *They shall dwell in God's hill that swear to their own hurt and change not;* Implying at least, that they will not go back from what they promise, though they might; yet Mr. Hobbes is resolved to give wicked Men their liberty, if they can escape the lash of the Law. And though Mr. Hobbes saith in the next page, and often in his Book,  
*That*

*That where there is no Commonwealth, there is no propriety nor any thing unjust: yet 'tis only his saying so, and for which in no place he gives any reason; for properly Just and Unjust were in the World before any such thing as a Commonwealth was thought of: as Cain and Abel had their distinct properties, and offered accordingly, when there was no Commonwealth formed, that we know of; and in all probability there was none. But Mr. Hobbes thinks he may say what he will, or else he would not reproach my Lord Cokes opinion in the same page without giving any reason, or circumstantiating the thing with any connective sence. Which opinion he saith is (though 'tis much older than my Lord Coke) that when the Crown descends to one attainted of Treason, it avoids the attainder; and why it should not be so I know not; only Mr. Hobbes had a mind to shew his ignorance, in respect of Antiquity, and his arrogance to quarrel with any thing, because found in the Works of so learned a Man.*

*Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 81. when an actor doth any thing contrary to the Law of Nature*

ture by the command of the Author, if he be obliged by covenant to obey him, not he; being none of his action, but the Author breaketh the Law of Nature. The English of this I conceive to be, That when a Man covenants to do any thing wicked in it self, as to do that to an other, one would not have done to him ( which Mr. Hobbes, p. 79. admits to be a Law of Nature ) as to break ones trust with a third person ; because he hath covenanted with a second person so to do, is no fault in the actor, but in him that set him on. This opinion is so unreasonable that 'tis worth nothing but laughing at : For 'tis apparent that both the Actor and the Author are guilty, and the making a covenant to do a wicked thing is wicked, and cannot excuse the Actor from guilt. And is a Man's action less his action, because he hath covenanted to do it ? 'Tis rather more his action, because he hath done it on that deliberation and voluntary undertaking.

Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 102. *That the Parent hath not dominion over the Child, because he begat him, but from the Child's consent either exprefs or implied.* But to do him right, in the next page he so limits this,

this, that he makes what he hath here said to signifie little or rather nothing. Yet this let me say, that a Parent upon the knowledge that he is such, hath the dominion over the Child, because he begot him; and ought to provide for the Child, although the Child never assent to it ( which cannot be supposed in young Children ) either expressly or impliedly. And if it should not be so, why should Children be bound to honour their Parents by the Law of God; or by the Law Civil why should Parents be bound to provide for their Children? It must be either upon the account of generation or no way; for there is no other reason to be given for the said Laws.

As Mr. *Hobbes* before called Metaphors causes of Sedition, now p. 111. saith, *That the reading Greek and Latine Authors hath begotten in Men from their childhood an habit of favouring Tumults and controuling Sovereigns.* This is like a Mahometan to discourage all kind of Learning; for he knew well enough that as many things are written of the Liberty of the People in other Languages as in Greek or Latine; which liberty



berty never was inconsistent with the true rights of Sovereignty, that ever I knew of. But Mr. *Hobbes* may be allowed to say this, when he hath the confidence to say, p. 108. *That liberty and necessity are consistent*; which I pass over as an absurdity by any capacity to be perceived, and also because I hear a late Bishop hath intolerably baffled him in that matter. Yet I cannot but observe that this Position is as good as his exposition, p. 106. of *Matth. 21. 2, 3.* That because the people let the Asses colt go to serve our Saviour ( which I think was miraculous ) That therefore the King's word is sufficient to take any thing from any subject, when there is need, and the King is Judge of that need. Ingenious Mr. *Hobbes* could find one argument for the Ship-money Case, and for the justifying of *Sibthorp's* and *Manwaring's* Sermons, that I never heard of before. But the nonsense of the Exposition cannot be made more gross than it appears in it self, and so I pass it by, with a great many such extravagant and arrogant humors in this part of his Book; because my Lord of *Clarendon* hath sufficiently exposed him in things of this kind.

Mr.

Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 116. *If a Corporation vote any thing not warranted by their Patent, this is not the act of any one that voted to the contrary, or is absent; though 'tis the act of the Body, and he that voted to the contrary is innocent; and if a pecuniary mulct be laid upon the Body, nothing shall be taken, the innocent person hath share in, though a common stock.* Mr. Hobbes I perceive thinks all he saith is Law as well as all is Gospel. Yet I think him not wise in this Paragraph to put the People into a way to cheat *Cesar* of his due; when in the last Chapter he gave *Cesar* so much more than ever any King of this Nation pretended to. For by this means taking the case as Mr. Hobbes states it; If a pecuniary mulct be laid upon a Corporation, the King can never know how to levy it upon the common stock; for saith he, *If that person, a member of the Body that voted contrary to the rest, hath any propriety in the common stock, (which I think is by the way impossible he should not have, as long as he is a member of the Corporation) then that stock is not to be medled with; and then it follows that the King cannot have his fine out of the common stock at all;* and

and Mr. *Hobbes* assigns him no other place to take it in, and consequently Mr. *Hobbes* hath left his Sovereign without remedy for his right. But Mr. *Hobbes* ought to know, that if a Corporation run into a pecuniary mulct by any vote, ( which is a case very unusual ) that in that case, all the goods of the stock in general or of any particular Man of the Corporation is liable, as well he that voted one way as the other, ( which the King's Officers cannot distinguish of ) because that every Man that is a Member of a Corporation doth come in voluntarily, and consequently must be supposed to submit himself to the actions of that Body, and intends to be bound, stand, and fall with them that are of it, as to all acts that are done by them as a Body; and therefore if the Body borrow money of a stranger, he that voted against the borrowing the money ( though Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 117. say the contrary ) is as well bound to the payment of it as he that voted for it.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 122. saith, *That if a particular Man's Right be to be determined in an Assembly, he may make as many friends as he can, nay may hire them with money,*

E

and

*and 'tis not unjust, without a Law to the contrary.* That is to say, A Man may bribe all the Judges of his case that he can, and so he that hath the best Purse, not he that hath the best Right, must carry it; except the Judges be so honest as not to take bribes, which must be supposed as lawful as the giving them. Mr. *Hobbes* though he ventured upon this Position could not but know how odious bribes are accounted in the Scripture, as *1 Sam. 8. 3.* where bribes and perverting of Judgment go together. And a gift *Deut. 16. 19.* is called, *The blinder of the Eyes and the perverter of Judgment*; and is expressly forbidden, *Exod. 23. 8.* But as Mr. *Hobbes* before had laboured to destroy all Religion, so now he is endeavouring to destroy all common Honesty; and dares say that which never any Man before durst, but was ashamed to own, though perchance he might be so wicked as to do it. And Mr. *Hobbes* gives no reason for this Position, but because, saith he, perchance Justice cannot be had without it; that is to say, every Litigant may be wicked, because it may be some Judges are. But though this opinion I believe hath been

as successful as any wicked opinion of Mr. *Hobbes* in all his Book, complying so much with Men's interests; yet he and every other Man ought to know, that a Man ought rather to venture the loss of his Right, than to do any thing repugnant to God's Word and common honesty, except Mr. *Hobbes* will invert all, and say, That 'tis better to gain some of the World, though he lose his own Soul.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 133. *That the words, Repent and be Baptized, are in Scripture Counsil and not commands: So, by his Rule, we may neglect either Repentance or Baptism without sin; but for this gives he no reason; Nay, he hath formerly allowed of the word Imperative, and yet now he will not allow of the Imperative Mood to bid or command; for 'tis Repent and be Baptized in English, and in Greek μετανοήστε καὶ βαπτισθήτω, which are Aorists of the Imperative Mood, and why then they should not be words of command, I know not; except because Mr. Hobbes in his new Models hath otherwise establish'd it. But observe Mr. Hobbes his reason why 'tis no command; Because,*

saith he, 'tis not to the benefit of God Almighty, but of our selves, that we do. Excellently argued Mr. *Hobbes*, for by the same reason we have no command upon us to obey any of God's Commands; for 'tis not for God's benefit but our own: Nay, we need obey none of them ( as Mr. *Hobbes* frequently argues ) because there is no Law enjoyns them, except where there is a Sovereign power that so commands. I suppose that his chief intent in this is to ease Men's Consciences, and to give wicked Men liberty to sin, having no command, as Mr. *Hobbes* here saith, from God to the contrary; what else should put this crotchet into Mr. *Hobbes* his Head, I know not. For if a Law be made for the good of the People, every Man is bound to perform it, and 'tis a command as well as an advise. The People asked St. *Peter* what they should do? *Repent and be Baptised*, saith he. And suppose a Child, being at the brink of a River, should ask his Father what he should do; if his Father should bid him go over the Bridge, would it not be a command? And certainly *Peter* had as much Authority in matters of Faith, as

a Parent hath in common actions. But I think this Position of Mr. Hobbes's is as true as his saying, p. 135. *That passion makes Men eloquent*; which is contrary to experience, except he means by Eloquence making a Noise, as he hath with his *Leviathan*, without sense or reason.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 139. saith, *That Customs are not Laws, by virtue of prescription of Time, but by constitutions of their present Sovereigns*. Here I suppose Mr. Hobbes principally aimed at the supplanting of our Common Law, and thereby make the readier way to bring all Men's Properties into incertainty and confusion; which was at the time 1651, the readiest means, and most plausible, to vest all in the Army, or him that should be turned up trump. For 'tis by the Common Law, that is, the general custom of the Nation, that most Men enjoy their Estates, either real or personal; now if length of time should not justify that property, without the constitutions of the Sovereign; and such constitutions could not be found, as 'tis most apparant they cannot, down goes the Common Law, and

Property with it, and then let the strongest take all. Witty Mr. *Hobbes* ! that can in a Treatise of Law lay down a Position that would destroy the Law of his native Country , and thereby make way for an arbitrary Power. But Mr. *Hobbes* , in the same Paragraph, makes a little amends for this; for though he had given the Common Law a box on one Ear to make it stagger, he hits it a clap on the other to set it upright again; for he saith, *That when an unwritten Law shall be generally observed, and no iniquity appear in the use of it, then it can be nothing but a Law of Nature , and obliges all mankind.* Well said Mr. *Hobbes* ; for now he makes every Custom ( which an unwritten Law implies ) unalterable by Act of Parliament ; for an Act of Parliament against the Law of Nature is void. This was a perfect rapture of Mr. *Hobbes*'s without consideration ; for is any thing more apparent than that generally Customs are no part of the Law of Nature, which is universal, and that customs of all Nations differ, according to the convenience of the several People ; and that which is good for one  
 People



People ( though the Law of Nature be the same to all ) is ill for another ; and that appears by the practices of all Nations that ever I heard of. But if Mr. *Hobbes* mean by the unwritten Law, the verbal command of his Sovereign, 'tis grosser nonsense than the other ; for a Law of Nature, *ex vi termini* , can only be produced by Nature, and not by any humane Institution ; Nature being previous to policy, and every thing being productive of its own Laws, or else they would be the Laws of others. But Mr. *Hobbes* saith excellent well, p. 143. *That all he saith is not presently Law* ; and 'tis the greatest piece of modesty I think in his whole Book ; and if he had but added, that his Incongruities had been innumerable, and not worth answering, in this Chapter, it had been fit to be ranked with his greatest Truths.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 144. saith, *That if a Man, accused of a capital Crime, fly for fear of the event, seeing his enemies Malice and Power and frequent corruption of Judges ; and maketh it appear upon his Trial he is not guilty, and be acquitted, yet by the Law he shall lose his Goods ; and this,*

saith Mr. *Hobbes*, is against the Law of Nature. I cannot say but that a case may be made, that a general Law may seem severe in, but therefore is a general Law against the Law of Nature, which is adapted to the generality of cases that may be supposed to happen; as in this case, 'tis adapted to persons flying, and not to the chance of every extraordinary, scarce to be supposed, particular. Yet even in that case the Law hath provided a remedy, and that is a power in the King to pardon upon such an occasion. But if Mr. *Hobbes* had not been resolved to quarrel with the Law of his native Country, he might more reasonably have said, That the Law in this particular is rational, because guilt makes a Man fly, and why should an innocent Man fly? And although one that fled may be acquitted upon his trial, yet it may be supposed that it was by reason that such a person had bribed the evidence or prosecutor, or the thing perchance might be so done in the dark, that although there was probable evidence to commit him, yet there might not be sufficient evidence to convict him as to the capital punishment, although

though he had convicted himself as to the loss of his goods, by giving such evidence of his guilt against himself as flying was; and the person hath reason to acknowledge the mildness of the Law, that makes not his flying sufficient evidence against his life and real estate, as well as personal: But to give an example of this; When Mr. *Hobbes* had written his Book, and was in *France*, he was (as my Lord of *Clarendon* saith) sought for to be attach'd, but then he fled into *England*; would not any body swear that Mr. *Hobbes* knew himself guilty of the abominable Doctrines in that Book? Or why should he fly if he thought himself innocent? And if Mr. *Hobbes* had been catch'd and arraigned for it, and there had wanted Evidence to prove him the Author, yet would not his own flight have been an evidence of guilt against him; though perchance not of conviction as to Treason and Blasphemy, in case the French Laws be as mild and gentle as the English? So I think the Law in this point is rather a probable sparing the guilty, than as Mr. *Hobbes* terms it a condemning the innocent; and though he in-

veighs

veighs so much against this Law in many peremptory words, (as is frequent with him upon all occasions) yet 'tis good for more innocent Men than he, that it be continued, lest the flight be adjudged evidence above all evidence, and a presumption of fact for absolute condemnation as well as for loss of goods, against which no proof shall be admitted, and the person condemned, as it were, out of his own Mouth. And though Mr. *Hobbes*, in the next page, rails against the saying; That this is a presumption of Law, against which no proof shall be admitted; yet suppose a Man confess a fact (as the *Amalekite* to *David*) is it unjust to deny any proof to the contrary? I think scarce, admit the person be in his wits; and this flying is a confession of the fact, as far as 'tis possible for actions to be equally significant with words. But Mr. *Hobbes*, to shew his farther Learning in the Law, saith, p. 145. *That there is a Law written, that a Man expelled by force shall be restored by force*: When as the Law is, That he shall be restored by the Justices and the Sheriff, which are Officers of Law, and in execution of their authority,

ity, wherein there is no force, as force is commonly taken, and that is unwarrantable violence.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 149. saith, *That a Man that hath no supernatural revelation of the will of God, is to obey for such the command of the Commonwealth.* And this he deduceth from two Texts; one that where God saith to *Abraham, I know thou wilt command thy Children, and thy House, to keep the way of the Lord:* ( which was only, as I conceive, God's witness of *Abraham's* fidelity to him ). The other Text he cites, is the peoples saying to *Moses, Speak thou to us, and we will hear, but let not God speak to us, lest we die:* ( which was only, as I think, an expression of the fear of the people at the mount of the Glory of God's Majesty, which before had been so terrible to them. ) And upon these two basis'es it is, that he founds several assertions of this kind in several parts of his Book; In which for once I will deal with Mr. Hobbes by whole sale, as p. 149, 199, 205, 232, 237. are to the same purpose, and in p. 241, 252. he something amplifies upon the Text, and saith, *That he, at the time of his Book, would affirm nothing*

*thing that was novelty, or a paradox in Religion, but would attend the end of that dispute of the sword, concerning the authority by which all sorts of Doctrine are to be approved or rejected, (though to do him right, p. 186. he hath a whole Paragraph against this) and whose commands, both in speech and writing, must be obeyed by those that intend to be protected. And further saith, p. 193. Except where God is temporal King, 'tis better to obey Man than God. And p. 249. saith, That the Laws of the Sovereign are to be obeyed in external acts and profession of Religion. And p. 360. saith, That we ought to pay Divine worship to a Sovereign if he command it, but Men may believe otherwise. And p. 250. he saith, That none can take notice what is, or what is not the Word of God, but the Sovereign. And p. 322, 323. saith, That the Bible is only Law, where the Civil Sovereign hath made it so. And in several places he saith, That no Man ought to regard Miracles or Prophecies, without supernatural revelation, because he cannot tell whether they are said or done to deceive. And many other places to the same effect: Thus, he. When this present Turk was in danger of being murdered by the*

the treachery of the Captains of the *Fanizaries*, to reduce the multitude to their obedience they did hang out *Mahomet's* banner, which many ran under out of Devotion, to be protected by it, and to defend *Mahomet's* Successor. But I dare say, none said more in defence of *Mahomet's* Doctrine than Mr. *Hobbes* hath here done, nor yet I believe so much; and no wonder, a *Renegado Christian* being always observed to be worse than a *Turk*. And thus much he goes further, than I believe the generality of the *Turkes* will: for they will stick to *Mahomet's* Doctrine in the *Alcoran*, let the *Grand Seignior* say what he will, but Mr *Hobbes* is for changing as often as the power of the Sword shall command. And one would have thought, that no man had been so impious, in so high a measure to have affirmed, *That 'tis better to obey the commands of Men than of God*: whereby he lays all under the dictates of the Sword; and makes the truth of God wholly to depend upon the power of Men; especially as to external acts of Worship, and that he himself 1650. attended to determin all. According to this Doctrine, if a *Papist* had been commander,

mander, we ought to have embraced  
 Romish Idolatry; if a *Jew* had come to  
 have been General of the Army, and  
 had bidden him be circumcised, and by  
 words renounce the Faith of Christ, he  
 would have done it; If a *Turk* had been  
 turned up trump, and bidden Mr. *Hobbes*  
 go to *Mecca* and worship at *Mahomet's*  
 tomb, he would have done it; If a  
*Persian* had proved uppermost, and had  
 bidden him worship at *Haly's* shrine, and  
 say *Haly* was a greater Prophet than  
*Christ*, he would have done it; Nay,  
 he would have asked no petition of  
 God or Man for 30 days, save of *Darius*,  
 had he been in the days of *Daniel*: So  
 I hope would no body else, for all the  
 Example of *Naaman*, which Mr. *Hobbes*  
 makes such use of, to justifie all exter-  
 nal acts of Idolatry: The Text is in the  
 2 *Kings* 5. 18, 19. where *Naaman*, after  
 profession to serve no God but the  
 true one; saith, *when I bow my self in the*  
*house of Rimmon ( my Master leaning on*  
*my hand ) the Lord pardon thy servant in*  
*this thing*; And *Elisba* said, *go in peace*.  
 Therefore 'tis lawful in external acts to  
 worship ( as Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 271. )  
 an Idol, and deny the true God in effect,  
 if



if we keep our Hearts close to him ; and such an action, saith he, if done according to the Law of a Man's Country, is not the Subjects act but the Sovereigns. But if the Devil take a Subject for his so doing, I would know, whether the doing by the Sovereign's command will redeem him. And as to the Text, it is impossible to plant the legality of Idolatrous external Worship upon it ; for the Prophet's bidding *Naaman* go in peace might be an Error in the Prophet, created by his conceit that he should hinder the propagation of the Worship of the true God in *Syria*, if he should deny so great a Man his request ; which was a failing in the Prophet's Faith in God : or perchance the Prophet only took the request to be, that he might bow in reverence to his Master, when his Master bowed to *Rimmon* ; as 'tis a custom amongst us, for Inferiours to rise from their seats, when Superiours do, out of respect to their Superiours, and whether way 'tis taken, no matter, for it can be no warrant for Idolatry when the Sovereign commands ; and 'tis plain no otherwise can it rationally be understood. But observe, the Prophet gives  
not

not *Naaman* leave to bow to *Rimmon* but in the house of *Rimmon*, which may be done upon other accounts, and the words are constructive: who then, but Mr. *Hobbes*, would have founded the legality of external acts of Idolatry upon such a ground? Which is certainly, if there be any such thing in the World, a denying of God before Men, and that is the way to be denied before God in Heaven; *Matth.* 10. 32. *Luke* 12. 8. and expressly, *Rom.* 10. 8. Confession with the Mouth and belief in the Heart go together, and are made the prerequisites to Salvation; and Mr. *Hobbes* admits, That confession with the Mouth is but a kind of External worship; and see the 3<sup>d</sup> of *Daniel*, and there we find, that the three Children refused to Worship *Nebuchadnezzar's* Image, and rather chose the furnace; and God in approbation of their so doing delivered them, by not suffering the fire to do them any harm, though it consumed their enemies; and *Nebuchadnezzar* was the Sovereign at that time that God had set over those three Children. And *Daniel* himself chose rather to be thrown into the Den of Lions, than to neglect the Worship of

of God, according to the Statut made by *Darius* and his Princes, as 'tis in the sixth of *Daniel*. Now then, let any rational Man judge, what a strange creature Mr. *Hobbes* hath made of himself; to take a Text of Scripture to warrant external acts of Idolatry, which from the Text it self appears otherwise constructive; and is not capable to be taken in the sence he would have it, to warrant this cursed and damnable opinion; when there are these and many other plain Texts of Scripture against this construction; though I am afraid that this gin hath caught near as many, as his assertion of the lawfulness of bribes. But he thought he would secure himself in the Year 1651. let the *Turk*, a *Jew*, or the Devil wear the Sword, for he would do as they bid him; for he saith, *All sorts of Doctrine are to be approved or rejected by the authority of the Sword*; which will let in the *Mahometan*, *Bannian*, or *Jewish* Doctrine, to be, at any change of State, equally capable as the *Christian* to be approved as true, and so ought to be followed by Mr. *Hobbes* his rule; For, (saith Mr. *Hobbes*) *how shall we know what are the commands of God, but by*

F super-

*supernatural revelation*, ( such I suppose he intends, as was to *St. John* in the Isle of *Patmos*, and supposeth there is no such thing now ) or by the command of the *Sovereign*, and who but the *Sovereign* can take notice what is the Word of God? Which I admit none can do so wicked as *Mr. Hobbes*, because their foolish hearts are hardned. But I would have *Mr. Hobbes* know, that the Books of the *Old Testament* were the Word of God, when there was no King in *Israel*, but every Man did that which was right in his own Eyes; and that the Books of the *Old and New Testament* were the Word of God, and so taken notice of, and obeyed by good Men, in the Year 1651. when there was no civil *Sovereign* to tell in *England* what was the Word of God, and what not; and the *Epistles* of *St. Paul* were the Word of God when he wrote them, although *Christianity* was then disowned by the *Roman Emperours*: Nay, they are the Word of God, and would be in the furthest part of *America*, ( for a word is a word though there be no Body to hear it ) where 'tis supposed there are no *Inhabitants*, were they thither carried. And 'tis but like the

the rest of Mr. *Hobbes* his Philosophy to say, that the Existence or Being of things depend upon Political Institution, when as the Being of things ever was, and ever will be absolute, let a Sovereign be or not be, say or not say. But a civil Sovereign hath power to model things indifferent in themselves, and to put them into such conjunctions as may be for his own and the good of those he governs; but hath not power to alter the beings of things, or at his pleasure to make that not to be that is, or to be that is not. And as to Mr. *Hobbes* his desiring to know, how we may know what is the Word of God, I have said something to it before, I hope that is satisfactory to any but a cavilling Atheist, in my Answer to his p. 32. and shall say little more here; save, that suppose there was a Country in which the People were *Christians* for the most part, and the Sovereign a *Mahometan*, that the delivery of the Bible, as the thing believed to be Gods Word by the consent and approbation of those Christians, is a sufficient testimony of its being the Word of God, joyned with the matter contained in it,

which is so apt to beget in every good Man a testimony that it is the Word of God ; and we have a greater testimony, by the general consent of Christian mankind that hath ever admitted them, since written , or the greatest part of them to be so ; besides, we have the improbability of the penmen of them to be corrupted, for which plentifully see the most Learned Dr. *stillingsfleet's Origines Sacrae*, and to the same Learned Book shall I refer my Reader as to the regard of miracles and prophecies ; yet I will observe, that though Mr. *Hobbes* frequently saith, *Miracles and Prophecies are not to be regarded without supernatural revelation*, yet he saith, p. 187. *That God reveals his Word by those that work Miracles* ; which admits the credibility both of one and the other, without supernatural revelation ; and is, in my opinion, like the rest of Mr. *Hobbes* his contradictions of himself.

Mr. *Hobbes*, being an excellent Man at all kind of Laws, saith p. 152. *That the Ignorance of civil Law shall excuse a Man in a strange Country till declared to him.* But Mr. *Hobbes* never tells whose part it is to watch all strangers that come in-  
to

to *England*, and to tell them the Law; lest the King's Subjects suffer loss, and the stranger offending be indemnified. And I believe few strangers will venture the punishment for breach of the Law, presuming to be justified by Mr. *Hobbes* his authority. And doubtless 'tis the duty of all Men to acquaint themselves with the Law of the place where they come, and expect protection, or else no State, Sovereign, or People, can be safe; but Mr. *Hobbes* is generally for Positions that tend to unhinge all the foundations of Government: yet Mr. *Hobbes* seems to say, which I cannot omit, *That no stranger ought to endeavour the alteration of Religion where he comes*, (how congruously to the precedent I leave others to judge) *because 'tis against the Law of Nature*; and this he doth say, or his words are not sense. But clearly, as the case may be, 'tis against the Law of Nature and of God not to endeavour to alter the Religion of a place by teaching; as suppose a true *Christian* should go into *Aurence Zebe's* Country, he ought to teach the true worship of God, out of charity to their Souls, that they might be saved by Jesus Christ;

and out of charity to their Bodies, that the Heathen Women amongst them might desist from burning themselves at the death of their Husbands; and indeed in this Position, Mr. *Hobbes* is more uncharitable than a *Jesuite*.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 156. *That when a Man is in the power of the enemy, the obligation of the Law ceaseth, and obedience to the enemy is no crime.* I suppose Mr. *Hobbes* means, that the obligation of all Law, both Natural and Civil, ceaseth, of which he treated just before; and this is but to say, that a Child being in the custody of his Fathers enemy, may ( if so commanded by the enemy ) kill his Father; or, to come closer to Mr. *Hobbes*, it is to say, that the murther of the old King was lawful by any Man that was under the power of the Army. O what comfort this was to those that did it ! But Mr. *Hobbes* ought to know, that the Law absolutely Natural, as between Children and Parents, and the Law suppositiously Natural, as between the Subjects and their King, is everlasting and universal, and that Children and Subjects are bound by that Law not to injure



injure their Parents or Sovereigns, let what will happen to them, or into what ever Power they come; because that Nature never ceaseth ( though sometimes it may be suppress'd ) in any Man: Nature ever being in any thing, as long as the thing hath existence, as 'tis natural for a Tree to bud as long as 'tis a live, and for a Child or Subject to love his Parent or Prince as long as they are in this World, to which the destruction of either is exactly opposite and contrary to his Nature, and consequently the doing of it is against that Law, and a damnable Sin. And further observe, that by this rule of Mr. *Hobbes's*, if a *Papist* get a *Protestant* into his power, that the *Protestant* may without sin worship a Crucifix or Wafer cake, in case the *Papist* bid him.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 158. *That a crime that hath been more frequently punish'd, is greater than that of which there hath been many precedent examples of impunity.* By this Argument, Plunder ( Military robbery ) was little less than lawful during the War, because seldom punish'd. And Duels, so contrary to the Nature of any civilized State, are lawful; and

the killing of Men in them, little less than warrantable, because so few have suffered for the fact of late days ; but certainly the scape of offenders alters not the crime, things being the same let external accidents happen this way or that.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 163. *That if a Subject deny his subjection, he may be proceeded against as an enemy, and suffer at the Sovereign's pleasure, let what Law soever be ordained against Treason.* There is no authority for this but Mr. *Hobbes* his saying so, and as little reason. For a Subject cannot cease to be a Subject when he pleaseth ; ( no more than a Son cease to be a Son at pleasure : ) Nay, he can never cease to be a Subject to his natural Prince, except the Laws of the Empire he is born in so limit subjection ; and therefore whatever such a Subject doth, or saith, he ought to be condemned or cleared by those Laws under which he was a Subject. And if this saying of Mr. *Hobbes* was true, no Man could tell who was a Subject to his Prince, and who not ; who was to be Arbitrarily punish'd, and who not ; but ( God be blessed ) there is no such thing  
as

as Arbitrary punishment in *England* to be inflicted upon any person whatsoever, or in any case whatsoever.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 168. *That 'tis a Seditious Doctrine to say, that every private Man is judge of good and evil actions: but shews no reason for his saying so, neither can he. For 'tis most apparent, if he mean private particular Men's actions, every Man is judge of his own, and 'tis impossible for any Commonwealth to take notice of them in particular; except Men act things contrary to Law, and then there are persons in all Nations appointed to take notice of the irregularity of those actions to punish them, and every Man must judge of his actions whether they are good or evil; that is against the Law of God or Man, or adventure the punishment. What else Mr. Hobbes should here mean than particular Men's actions, I know not, and then certainly 'tis nonsense for him to say, 'Tis Seditious for a Man to judge of the good or evil of his own actions. But this is as true, as his saying in the next page, That 'tis no sin for a Man to act against his Conscience where there is a Commonwealth; Although St. Paul, when*  
he

he was at *Corinth* and wrote to the *Romans*, who were all at that time under a Commonwealth, thought the contrary, or else he would not have said, *Rom. 14. 23.* That *he that doubteth is damned if he eat*; certainly much more he is damned, that not only doubteth of the illegality of an action, but believeth that 'tis unlawful to eat, and is satisfied in his Conscience of it. And certainly from the reason of the thing, to act against a Man's Conscience must be a sin, because it is a daring to do that which is displeasing to God (whether the particular act in it self was displeasing to him or no) and consequently an affront to God, and a not setting a due estimate upon his Power and Goodness.

Mr. *Hobbes* hath several leaves together, and in other precedent parts of his Book, been laying down Rules for a Government, and p. 176. saith, *That those Principles of Reason which he lays down will make the constitution of his Government, except by external violence, everlasting.* And what those Principles are, my Lord of *Clarendon* ( a Noble and equal Adversary, both to absolute Power and confusion) hath fully set forth,  
and

and made sufficiently ridiculous. But Mr. *Hobbes*, after his long Treatise of an Earthly, comes to an Heavenly Sovereign, and that is God himself, and cites places of Scripture, *p.* 186. very devoutly, even before the Sword in 1651. had determined what was Scripture, and what not. And the first on-let Mr. *Hobbes* makes for erecting the Kingdom of God, is the telling us, that God's Kingdom over Vegetables and Beasts is but Metaphorical, for he only is properly said to Reign that Governs his Subjects by his Word and Promises, which things Inanimate (saith Mr. *Hobbes*) are incapable of. But why he saith, That God is not *properly* but *Metaphorically* King of Beasts and Inanimates as well as Men, he gives no reason; and *Psal.* 47. 7. saith, *That God is King of all the Earth* expressly; if of all the Earth, then of Beasts and Inanimates: And 'tis further plain, that God is King of Vegetables and Beasts, for that he Rules them by his Word and Power, and provides for them as well as Men, and it is the property of a King to Govern, and what he Governs he is King of, and may as well be said to be  
King

King of these as of Men; the Word *King* being but a contraction of the Saxon word *Cyning*, which signifies Chief.

Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 187. *That the right of Nature, whereby God Reigns over Men, and punisheth them for breach of his Laws, is derived not from Creating them, as if he required obedience as of gratitude, but from his irresistible Power; as if a Man had had power above all the rest, there had been no reason but that he should have Ruled according to his own discretion. And to irresistible Power (further saith he) the Dominion of all Men naturally adhereth; hence it is, that God's Kingdom over Men, and his right of afflicting them at his pleasure, belongeth naturally to God not as Creator and Gracious, but as Omnipotent, and his right to afflict Men is not always from sin, but from his Power. Thus ends this abominable Paragraph, which I almost tremble at when I read it; yet he indeavours to confirm it by places of Scripture in the next page, (which by and by I shall come to) which makes me think it impossible for the Devil to raise any Heretick so abominable, but that he will find Texts of Scripture to*  
cite

cite in favour of his Opinions; and if any Heretic ever deserved to be burn'd, certainly the Author of this Paragraph doth; it being a Text from which naturally ariseth these four Doctrines, first, That Mr. *Hobbes* or any Man else ( if Mr. *Hobbes* here saith true ) may without ingratitude dethrone his Maker if he can; because Man is obliged to God, as he saith, only because of his Power. Secondly, That all right of Government, or acting ( which he makes the same ) what any one pleaseth; is from Power. ( There's an end of Dr. *Gosdwin's* *Dominium fundatur in gratia.* ) So that ten highway Men have right to take all they can get from any two other Men, because they are stronger. And any Subject may depose his King, if he be able, ( good Doctrine for a Popish cabal ) and as long as he is stronger than the people may Rule them at his own discretion. Thirdly, That it is consistent with the Nature of God to be cruel to Man, although Man had never offended him. Fourthly, That no gratitude is due to God by Man for Creating him, though he hath made him *little lower than the Angels, in his own Image, and*  
 Crown-

Crowned him with glory and honour, and made him capable of being blessed for ever. The Impiety of all this is enough to put any Man into an amaze; But he must be out of an amaze that Answers Mr. *Hobbes* in this place, for observe how subtle he is, (being led by the instigation of the Devil) to put the right of Government and Power of punishment together, as if they were expressive of the same thing, and necessarily connext, it being impossible for a King to govern without a Power to punish; when as the right and the Power to act, may be as far distant as right and wrong, though frequently in Civil actions they are conjoyned. As for Example, When a Sheriff executes a Man for Murder, he hath both right and Power to do so; But when Sir *Edm. Bury Godfrey* was decoy'd into *Somerset-house*, and there strangled with a twisted Handkerchief, by *Romish* Priests and Jesuits, there was irresistible Power to do the fact, but no right to do it. So 'tis apparent, that this putting Power of punishment and a right of Government together, is nothing but a fallacy; the Proposition having Truth in it only



only *pro hic & nunc*, not universally. But to reason the case a little with Mr. *Hobbes*, as to Gods right of governing of us, because he is our Creator and gracious. Suppose a company of Men were here together upon Earth, and all of equal Power, and one in particular had conferr'd signal benefits upon all the rest, and they having no King or Governour were resolv'd to choose one from amongst themselves; Ought they not in gratitude ( which I think little less than creates a natural right ) to choose their Benefactor to that honour before any one else ? Certainly they ought, in any sober Man's judgment. Why then is it not naturally right, that Men obey God out of love, because he hath done so much for them, as to create them in such a sublime State, and his continuing still to be gracious to them, ( to which Mr. *Hobbes* to do him right agrees, *p.* 190.) as well as because he is Omnipotent, and by consequence hath Power to punish their disobedience. I might here say, That 'tis as natural for Man to obey his Creator, as 'tis for a Son to obey his Father; but that Mr. *Hobbes* before ( so far as he is intelli-

intelligible ) hath denied any obedience due to a Father upon the account of generation. Now since Mr. *Hobbes* for this Paragraph cites places of Scripture, even in the Year 1651. before the Sword had determined what was Scripture and what not; let me cite some ( now 'tis the Year 1679. and all Men have agreed the Bible to be the Word of God ) to prove, that God hath a right to Rule as he is Creator and gracious, and to shew the apparent falseness of what Mr. *Hobbes* hath said in this page. *Rom. 9. v. 20, 21.* clearly shews, that God as Creator hath power or liberty, as the word *ἐξουσίαν* signifies, to order his Creatures as he pleaseth, and that upon the account as Creator, for he is there compared to the *Potter*. 'Tis true, those Texts speak only of *making* of Men, and Mr. *Hobbes* is now upon the *governing* of Men; but observe, those Texts relate to the future state of Men, which God as Creator hath liberty or power to order as he pleaseth. And *Isaiah 37. v. 26.* There God saith by the Prophet, *That he had formed the Earth, and brought it to pass that Sennacherib should lay wast Cities.* Where observe, That

That God's creating the World, and his Government of it, go together, which to my apprehension shews his right to Govern upon the account of creating. 'Tis true, irresistable power God is pleased to make use of, to punish wicked Men; as in this last mentioned Chapter he is said to do, by *putting an hook in Sennacherib's Nose*, and *a bridle in his Lips*, and *turning him back*, like an unruly strong beast; but God rules his own People by love, and they obey him upon the account of his Goodness, (*for the love of Christ constrains Men*) and as he is their Creator, and thereby hath the right to govern them: But 'tis true, wicked Men obey him because they cannot help it; yet from thence it follows not, that God hath not right to govern wicked Men as he is their Creator. And to stop Mr. *Hobbes* his mouth, let him read the 20. *Exod. v. 2. 3, 4, &c.* and he will find, that God tells the *Israelites* what he had done for them, and immediately ensues his commands; which clearly tells any rational Man, that God hath right to govern upon the account of his Goodness, and with this accords all the Chapters in *Deuteronomy*

G

*homy* that treat of obedience, and clearly shew that 'tis due upon the account of God's goodness. But now I come to Mr. *Hobbes* his Texts of Scripture, which he cites for his opinion, and they as little justify his opinion, as his opinion is agreeable to Truth. He introduceth his Texts by saying, *that it stagger'd all sorts of Men, The prosperity of the wicked, and the adversity of the good, and particularly David, Psalm 73. v. 1. 2, 3.* which verses treat of *David's* wonder at the prosperity of the wicked, and never goes on to the 17. 18, 19, 20. verses, where *David* expresseth his satisfaction as to that matter. And then Mr. *Hobbes* proceeds to *Job's* Expostulation with God about his afflictions, notwithstanding his righteousness; and this, he saith, *God answers not by arguments drawn from Job's sin but his own power*, and quotes, *Job 38. v. 4.* where God saith, *where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the Earth?* In which Text, I think (as well as the whole Chapter) Mr. *Hobbes* answereth himself, and shews God's Sovereignty by reason of his Creation; but Mr. *Hobbes* saith, this approved *Job's* innocence; why I know  
not

not, either from the Text or Context ; and *Job* saith himself, *Chap. 40. v. 4. I am vile and cannot answer.* And then *Mr. Hobbes* cites the saying of our Saviour, 'tis the 9th of *John v. 3.* That our Saviour saith, *That neither the blind Man nor his Parents had sinned, but that the works of God might be manifest in him.* Therefore he would conclude, that sin is not always the cause of punishment. Why? For no reason, but because God was pleased to make this Man without sight, ( as he might have done all the World ) that his son *Jesus*, our blessed Lord and Saviour, might afterwards work a Miracle upon him for the settling the Gospel; Or it may prove, that God may make Man as he pleaseth, as the Potter may order the clay. Is this any thing to punishment at all? It is impossible, for 'tis no punishment to be created as God pleaseth; for punishment is a deprivation of some good a Man hath had, and 'tis no punishment for a Man not to have that which he never had, or had any right to till God gave it him; and *Mr. Hobbes* might as well have said, that 'tis a punishment for him not to be born to 1000 *l.* a year be-

cause his Neighbour was, as that 'tis a punishment for a Man to be born without Eyes, because his Neighbour was born with Eyes. One would wonder that any Man in his wits should cite so many Texts of Scripture, and so little to a purpose. And then, saith Mr. *Hobbes*, *Though death entred by sin, yet God might have afflicted Adam though he had never sinned*; and here Mr. *Hobbes* breaks off, without giving any shadow of reason or authority for his assertion. What God might have done by his Prerogative, I know not; but this I say, that I never read in the Bible of any affliction upon a people, but it was for sin, at least sin preceded; and all along the Bible, God lays the reason of his punishments upon his peoples sins, as well as the punishments of other Nations upon their sins; and why then Mr. *Hobbes* should say, *That punishments are not always from Men's sins*, is impossible to find a sound reason; and admit God should lay some affliction upon an innocent person, were there any such, (which is absolutely, or the next to blasphemy to affirm) yet this would not be punishment, but an act of his Will and Power; and admit  
he

he may do such a thing, it doth not therefore follow, that ever God did, as Mr. *Hobbes* hath affirmed, but not proved.

Mr. *Hobbes* saith, p. 190. *That knowledge and understanding cannot be attributed to God; and to justifie himself, gives a definition of them, and that is, That they are nothing in us but tumults of the mind, raised by External things that press the Organs of the Body, and there is no such thing in God.* I doubt when Mr. *Hobbes* wrote this he had a tumult in his mind, for any rational Man would think him mad, who confesseth a God, that notwithstanding shall deny God one of his great Attributes, and one so great, that without it all the rest would signifie nothing, and that is Knowledge or Understanding; and this for no reason, but because God cannot be said to understand things in the same manner that we do, (admitting Mr. *Hobbes* his definition true, which is false, Tumult being an enemy to understanding) God having no organical parts. For is it not possible, that a Being more excellent should understand things in another manner than one that is less excel-

lent? 'Tis rational to suppose it may. Besides, the Scriptures expressly ascribe knowledge to God; as amongst the rest, *Amos 3. v. 2. Gal. 4. v. 9.* expressly mention God's knowledge. And to deny God's knowledge, is to deny God; that is, a Being infinitely wise. So that I may truly (if not improperly) changing the Text of Scripture say, that Mr. *Hobbes* acknowledgeth a God, but in words denies him. And in the next page, to prevent being confused in this matter, Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *'Tis a dishonour to God to dispute about his Attributes.* Certainly then Mr. *Hobbes* is guilty of a greater dishonour to God, to deny his Attributes. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~  
 And in p. 192. Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *That only those Attributes of God are to be allowed in public worship, which the Sovereign ordaineth.* So now 'tis uncertain whether he will allow him any Attributes of perfection in public worship, or no; for in case the Sovereign prove as bad, or worse than *Julian*, and command Injustice or Ignorance to be those Attributes, that are only to be allowed or used for signs of honour, ( as he saith Attributes are ) no other must be used.



used. And now he hath made the honour of God wholly to depend on the will of Man, that is the Sovereign; yet in this Mr. *Hobbes* grows a little better, for here ( though before he had denied God his Attributes ) he gives the Sovereign power to restore God's Attributes to him again. But what nonsense is this, that a Sovereign, that is a Man upon Earth and God Almighty his creature, should be said to have power to dispose of God's Attributes, who is the commander of all the World. This is against the nature of Powers disposal, for he disposeth only that hath the supreme Power of disposing. And the sense of this, is ~~the~~ like Divinity of this, as well as of that which follows, and that is Mr. *Hobbes* his interpretation of the Text of Scripture, (*viz.*) 'Tis better to obey God than Man; which he saith hath only place in the Kingdom of God by pact, and not by Nature. That is to say, ( as I suppose that am a little acquainted with his language ) when a people have made an express covenant with God to obey him, as the *Israelites* did by *Moses*, they ought rather to obey God than Man; but all

other people, over which God hath only a natural Kingdom, that have made no particular covenant ( as none can now a days as Mr. *Hobbes* said before ) with God, ought to obey Man rather than God. So now we may lawfully be Papists, Turks, Jews, Infidels, or any thing that Man commands us ; and this place opens Mr. *Hobbes* to the life in what I have spoken to before about this matter ; and so I shall say no more of it in this place.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 195. coming to handle the Nature and Rights of a Christian Commonwealth, calls our natural Reason the *undoubted word of God*. So I thank him that something he allows to be the undoubted Word of God, and that God hath not wholly left us without his Word to direct us ; though Mr. *Hobbes* would not allow us the Scriptures to be so, without Man's approbation. But I think Mr. *Hobbes* had done much better, if in this place he had set up the *Light within us*, and thereby turned *Quaker*, to be the undoubted Word of God ; for then he would have had *George Fox* of his side : Or if he had said our senses had been the

the undoubted Word of God, I should sooner have believed him; for that all mankind (as we see daily) is less apt to err in matters of sense than matters of Reason. And according to what Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *If a Man's natural Reason tell him, that the World is eternal, à parte ante and parte post, 'tis the undoubted Word of God, and accordingly to be believed;* for I suppose Mr. *Hobbes* will grant that God is to be believed: I not remembering that ever Mr. *Hobbes* hath denied God his Truth, though he hath denied him Understanding and Knowledge. And by the same argument, if the *Israelites* natural Reason had told them, that the Calf brought them out of the Land of *Egypt*, it was to have been believed even by *Moses* and *Aaron*: And if a Man's natural Reason should tell him, that for gain he might cut his Neighbours throat, we ought to believe it, for that the Word of God is in every place and part of it to be believed. But suppose a Man's natural Reason should tell him, that Mr. *Hobbes* his *Leviathan* is a Book not only full of Blasphemy but Nonsense, and particularly in this Paragraph, ( where he goes with

a great deal of other unintelligible matter from calling Reason the Word of God, to say *Reason is to be made use of in acquiring of peace, &c.* and saying, *When in Reason there is any thing contrary to God's word, the fault is either in ill interpretation or erroneous ratiocination,* (which makes all he said signifie nothing,) would Mr. *Hobbes* admit, that this Man's Reason was the Word of God? No, I believe he would say, That there was a fault in this Man's ratiocination; as I am sure there is in Mr. *Hobbes's* in the next page, where he saith, *That God may speak to a Man by Dreams, Visions or Inspiration, but no other Man is bound to believe it;* which taken as an universal proposition, makes an end of all belief in the Scriptures. But of this I have spoken before, and referred matters of this nature, as well as the knowledge of a true Miracle or Prophet, to the Learned *Origines Sacrae*; which I hope any rational, or good Man, will rather read and regard upon that subject than Mr. *Hobbes* his *Leviathan*: So little consistent with it self, or intelligible by any rational Man, besides the Errors and foolish Interpretations

tions of Scripture, and particularly of *Deut. 13. v. 5.* which saith, *That a dreamer or a Prophet, that seeks to make Men revolt from God, shall be put to death;* Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *That that place is equivalent to revolt from the King.* And also his interpretation of the *1. of Gal. 1, 8.* where *Paul* saith, *That he that preacheth any other Gospel let him be accursed,* that is, saith Mr. *Hobbes*, *that Christ is King;* and hence he infers, *That all preaching against the Power of the King is accursed;* which let it be as true as it will in it self, is such an unreasonable inference, that 'tis not capable to be more exposed. But now I think upon it, 'tis probable Mr. *Hobbes* look'd into Scripture to find a Text which may maintain, that they were accursed in 1651. that Preached revolting from *Oliver's Army;* or that the said Army (who had the Power, and consequently was Mr. *Hobbes* his King, which he attended to determin matters of Religion) could not settle any thing for Scripture, or Religion, it pleased; or that Preached that any thing ought not to be observed of *Mahomet's* doctrine for Religion, that the *Turk* teacheth within

within his Dominions, or that a *Papist* should teach, if uppermost. So now Mr. *Hobbes* hath done like a Scholar, as he may well think, to find a place in the Bible to prevent Preaching against the *Alcoran* or *Maß*: Yet to do Mr. *Hobbes* Right, after his so many assertions, that that only is to be acknowledged as Canonical Scripture which the Civil Sovereign saith is so, and that in 1651. he attended the determination of the Sword to decide all Doctrines, he saith, *That he can acknowledge nothing to be Canonical Scripture, but that which the Church of England hath commanded to be acknowledged for such*; and I think there is nothing so near an Orthodox opinion in all his Book: but I suppose he meant, that he would acknowledge it to be so, only until the Sword had at that time determin'd it.

After Mr. *Hobbes* had laid down positive general Rules for enervating the Scriptures, in saying, *That the Authority of them depended upon the determination of the Sovereign*; now in his 33. Chap. he comes to the particulars of the several Books of the Scriptures, and hopes there

there I suppose to compleat the work: For he saith, *That the several Books, especially of the Old Testament, were not written by those that are commonly supposed to be the Penmen of them, but by others a long time after their deaths,* (which, if true, may raise a scruple to the truth of them) only he saith, *That he supposeth Moses wrote the greatest part of Deuteronomy, else that the Old Testament was penned generally by Esdras,* for which he cites the *Apocrypha, Esdras the 14th Chapter*; and when he hath done so, takes it for granted, that *Esdras* penned them after the captivity. To answer particularly Mr. *Hobbes* in this, would require a very large Discourse, enough to tire out both Me and my Reader; besides I think it not worth my while to answer general assertions in matters of fact, which are contrary to the general admissions of the most Learned Men, with long Discourses; but rather content my self with saying, that they are not to be credited, but rejected. Yet to that which Mr. *Hobbes* is particular in, I shall answer particularly. He saith, *The Pentateuch was penned long after Moses death,* and for this he cites the

12. of *Genesis* v. 6. which saith, *That when Abraham passed through the Land to the plain of Moreh, the Canaanite was then in the Land: Which shews clearly,* saith Mr. Hobbes, *that this Book was written after Moses time, because the Canaanite was not displaced till after Moses death.* But if Mr. Hobbes had well considered, and look'd into the 7th verse, he would have found that God promised Abraham the Land, in which at that time Abraham built an Altar unto the Lord; which was as it were a taking possession of the Land, and by God's gift he had a better right to it, as to futurity, than the *Canaanite* had: whereupon Abraham by Faith look'd upon the future time, and saw the *Canaanite* displaced, and knew that by force of God's promise the *Canaanites* antient right, to them and their posterity, was changed. So that the *Canaanites* as to the succession, might be rather said to have had the Land than that they had it, and so is the 48. *Gen.* 21. to be understood. Or may not the Text be rationally intended, that Moses said this to declare that the *Canaanite* was then in the Land, and not any other people.



ple. How unreasonable then it is, for Mr. *Hobbes* to change a general supposition, at the best but upon a doubtful Text of Scripture, and an Apocryphal story, I shall refer to any Man that hath his reason; and if reason be on my side, Mr. *Hobbes* ought to be so too, because he said before, that Reason is the Word of God. The rest of Mr. *Hobbes* his Texts to prove this, are nothing to the purpose, and so I pass them over. As to the Pen-men of the Books of the New Testament, he determines nothing, but saith, *That they were made Canonical by the Church, and that the writers of them were indowed with God's spirit, in that they conspire to the setting forth the rights of the Kingdom of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Let me then ask Mr. *Hobbes*, why they need to be made Canonical, and to be approved or rejected by the Sovereign, or his reciprocal Word, the Sword?

Mr. *Hobbes* said, p. 38. *That the Scriptures, by the spirit of God in Man, mean a mans spirit inclined to godliness;* the falseness of which, I have upon that page spoken to. Now p. 207. he comes to treat of Spirits in general, what they are,

are, and saith, if I rightly understand him, ( which I think is difficult in so perplex'd a discourse as he makes all over this his 34. Chapter ) *That they are bodies*, for he saith, *that substance and body are the same thing.* And p. 17, 53, 214. saith, *that all substances must be bodies*, and *that the words incorporeal substance joined together, are unintelligible, nonsense, and imply a contradiction*: And so runs on further in his old vein of making positive affirmations, contrary to the general received opinion of all Christian Men; without giving any reason at all for his so saying. But to reason the matter a little: why are the words *incorporeal substance* contradictory? Why may there not be a substance that hath no Body, as well as a substance that hath one? For substance is nothing but that which doth *subsist* such and such qualifications as are proper, and do belong to the being or nature of the thing in which those qualifications are, and without which those qualifications could not be, for want of something to support them. As we may say that Iron, which is a corporeal substance, is hard, so we may say, that

that a thing of a more subtle existence or substance is intelligent, rational, or wise; For that it may be equally capable to support these, as the Iron doth hardness, colour, or any other qualification. Now then to say, that *body* and *substance* are the same thing, is only a positive saying, and if the words had been never thought on before, might as well signifie *variously* as the *same*. Then certainly 'tis a strange piece of confidence, to obtrude such a position upon the World without any possibility of reason, which is contrary to the sentiments of all Learned persons that ever I heard of. But if Mr. *Hobbes* ask me, what a Spirit is, if it be not a Body? I must say, that I can no more tell the likeness of it, than Mr. *Hobbes*, supposing he had never seen by some external obstruction any thing, nor spoken with them that had, could have told what a like thing an Horse, or a grey Hound is; things incapable, and things obstructed, giving the same account of their proceedings. But 'tis apparent, that there is such a thing as a Spirit, for our Saviour saith, *Luke 24. 39. Handle me, and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh*  
H and

and Bones, as ye see me have. And if not Flesh and Bones, of what must a Spirit consist that is corporeal? I hope Mr. *Hobbes* will not say, that 'tis made like his deciding Sword, of Iron and Steel. But the apprehension that we can have of a Spirit is, that it is something that is no object of our Senses, and so not Mathematically descriptable, but an object of our Understandings; which apprehend that a good Spirit is wise and knowing, and that an evil Spirit is subtle and cunning. But what shall we say then of Mr. *Hobbes* his Spirit, ( that is his Soul ) which is neither wise, subtle, nor cunning? To this I shall only say, that I think 'tis no Body, by reason it hath actuated every part of his Body, and been in the same for near 80 Years together, which it could not have been had it been Body, for this would be to make several Bodies in one place at the same time, which Mr. *Hobbes* disallows of. So then, the Soul of Man must be something that is not Body, that is as we call it *Spirit* or *Spiritual substance*, created by God in Man, as Life was breathed into *Adam* and all other living creatures. But Mr. *Hobbes*, after his  
 Philo-

Philosophical discourse concerning the corporeousness of a Spirit, cites Texts of Scripture to shew what the meaning of *Spirit* is there: His first is, *Gen. 1. 2.* where 'tis said, That *the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters.* This, he saith, is meant a wind wrought by God, because motion is attributed to it, and consequently place, and nothing can be moved that changeth not place; or hath not dimension, and whatsoever hath dimension is Body. Admirable Philosophy! For mark the Argument, motion and place belong to Bodies, therefore nothing but a Body can have motion or place. Suppose a Man should reply upon Mr. *Hobbes* and say, Ears belong to an *Ass*, therefore nothing but an *Ass* can have Ears: what a trouble would this be to Mr. *Hobbes*, to be made an *Ass* by his own Argument; which supposeth all things to be the same, to which any one circumstance or qualification equally belongeth. But fully to answer Mr. *Hobbes*, motion in this place of Scripture is intended, as I think, of the special and extraordinary operation of God's Spirit, ( though some Interpreters take it, I confess, to be a wind impulsed by God's

H z                      Spirit,

Spirit, like *Gen.8.1.*) upon the Waters, and not to denote God's moving from place to place as Bodies do; for in that sense neither motion nor place can be attributed to God, who is every where, but in no place either circumscriptively or definitively, as Bodies are. But it follows not therefore, that God by his Spirit cannot extraordinarily act in one place more than another, without becoming a Body, as he did in the creation upon the Waters. And 'tis not sense to say, that of necessity dimension must belong to that which hath motion or place; because that Bodies that have motion and place have dimension; for 'tis to make a general conclusion of the Being of a thing, from a particular qualification, and that would be to make Men Beasts, and Beasts Men, as I hinted before. But I confess, that the word *Spirit* in Scripture and common discourse hath various significations, as Mr. *Hobbes* hath plentifully discoursed; but what that makes to the impossibility of a substance being incorporeal, I know not, neither do I think it conceivable. And I cannot agree with Mr. *Hobbes*, in his  
 seve-

several quotations of Scripture that mention our Saviour, who was indowed with God's Spirit, and 'tis abominable to question it, and several eminent Persons, as *Gideon, &c.* to be indowed with God's Spirit ; *that those places*, as he saith, *only mean, that our Saviour and others had special virtues for such purposes ( but that God had not inspired his Spirit into them ) to inable them to perform such and such things ;* as when he cites the 6. of Judges v. 34. which saith, that *the Spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon, that is,* saith Mr. *Hobbes*, *Gideon had courage to defend God's people.* And this let me add, that if it was barely courage in *Gideon*, it was the strangest courage that I ever read of ( except that of *Jonathan* ) to attack so great an host, as that of *Midian* was, with only 300 Men, and the arms of them nothing but Trumpets, Lamps, and Pitchers. But if this Interpretation of Mr. *Hobbes* was true, *Oliver Cromwel*, or any other valiant Man, might be said to have God's Spirit as well as *Gideon*, although we do not find that so much as any of *David's* Worthies, in the repetition of their great acts, are said to have it;

when we cannot suppose, but that they had as much courage as *Gideon*, and upon that account might as easily have been said to have God's Spirit, if by God's Spirit in such Men is only meant courage. What folly then is it for Mr. *Hobbes* to affirm this, having no warrant for it but his own fancy? To which he hath given so great a latitude, as in this Chapter most damnably and prophanely to make nothing of the blessed Spirit of God, but a Ghost, as p. 209. which in other places he makes the companion of Goblins, both which he takes to be, as indeed they are, the imaginations of distempered brains, such as Mr. *Hobbes* his was when he wrote this interpretation of places of Scripture of this kind; when in p. 58. he saith, *That the Scriptures mean by the Spirit of God in Man, a Man's Spirit inclined to godliness*; and here he saith, *they mean the particular virtues Men are endowed with for such purposes*; and whether this be not the next thing to a contradiction, I shall refer to any one that hath so much virtue and godliness as to speak true: for a godly Man, that is, one devout towards God, may not be in-



indowed with any other virtue. And then Mr. *Hobbes* comes to Texts of Scripture concerning our Saviour, as to this matter, it is *Luke* the 4<sup>th</sup> v. 1. and *Matth.* 4. 1. that express our Saviour to be full of God's Spirit: *This*, saith Mr. *Hobbes*, *was a zeal to do God's work, but* (saith he) *to say God was fill'd with God, is improper and insignificant.* And this last I shall be beholding to Mr. *Hobbes* for hereafter, when I come to p. 268. where Mr. *Hobbes* denies the existence of God the Holy Ghost, and the Godhead of the Son, for here he confesseth the Godhead of both of them. But to return to this page I am now upon; Mr. *Hobbes* is certainly upon a wrong ground (though I will not say how the blessed Spirit of God is communicated or infused into Man, or was in our blessed Saviour) to suppose, that God the Holy Ghost must be infused into the Godhead of the Son, and that the Godhead must be full of the Godhead, for our Saviour had an humane Nature, which he might not out of his good pleasure indow with all the graces of God's Spirit upon the assumption, but sufferr'd it rather to attend

the blessed Spirit for the plenitude of them; and this is agreeable to all the Interpreters of those Texts that ever I saw, except Mr. Hobbes his *Leviathan*. And Mr. Hobbes saith further, *That in these last mentioned Texts the word Spirit either signifies a real substance, (which he said before must be a Body,) or else metaphorically signifies some extraordinary ability.* This I mention to shew, that taking Mr. Hobbes together he calls God the Holy Ghost a *Body*; though hereafter p. 268. he denies him any real existence at all. x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x  
 x Mr. Hobbes in this Chapter cites many Texts, to prove that Angels have Bodies and dimensions, as those that went to *Lot* into *Sodom*, and other like. This I shall not dispute with Mr. Hobbes, though 'tis more probable and agreeable to the opinion of the generality of the World, that they assumed Bodies upon those particular occasions by the direction of God Almighty. But then with another argument, he thinks to make it sure that Angels have Bodies, because Hell-fire is prepared for the Devil and his Angels, *and fire*, saith he, *can only work upon a Body.* I suppose Mr.

Mr. *Hobbes* means our fire can only work upon a Body, and then mark the strong consequence; *Ergo*, God cannot make any other sort of fire that can work upon something not Body. Mr. *Hobbes* might as well have said, that if we never had had any fire, God could not have made such a thing as fire. Nay, Mr. *Hobbes* in this place confesseth, *That the evil Angels shall not be consumed in this fire*; and this shews 'tis a fire not like ours, and so Mr. *Hobbes* hath answered himself, in which faculty he is the happiest Man that I ever knew. But to come closer to Mr. *Hobbes*, he I think would be troubled to make out, that our fire cannot work upon a thing that is immaterial; for it follows not, that because it burns wood, it will burn nothing that is not in the same manner substantial. But after all, what is this (taking it as Mr. *Hobbes* would have it, that Angels have Bodies and dimensions) to prove that the words *incorporeal substance* imply a contradiction? That is, in plain English, there is no substance but hath a body, that is to say, the great God of Heaven and Earth (though Mr. *Hobbes* speaks plain only  
concer-

concerning Angels) hath a Body, and consequently, as Mr. *Hobbes* saith, hath dimensions and consequently is finite and not infinite. So Mr. *Hobbes* may in time deny all the Attributes of God, for before he hath denied his Knowledge, and now his Infinity by direct consequence. But whether Mr. *Hobbes* never thought of this sequel, as I have so much charity for him ( knowing his weakness in other places ) to believe he never did, or whether the Atheism was so gross that Mr. *Hobbes* durst not speak out plain, I shall leave to the Reader to determine.

Mr. *Hobbes* now comes to tell what the meaning of the words *Kingdom of God* signifie in Holy Scripture, as he calls it *properly*; which he defines to be, p. 217. *God's dominion over a people by special contract*; As the people of *Israel* were subjects, by the special covenant made by God with *Abraham*, as in *Gen.* 17. whereby *Abraham* and his Seed were obliged to obey God's positive Law, as by an oath of Allegiance; for to the Moral Law they were obliged before. This I suppose Mr. *Hobbes* intends for a foundation of God's distinct King-

Kingdom, as will appear by and by, never distinguish'd from his general Dominion before, that ever I heard of ; neither is there any cause to distinguish it now, as he doth, by necessary supposition, or else all he saith signifies nothing. But methinks this is too slender a foundation for such a work, and the supposition ( that is, that *Abraham* and his Seed were not obliged to obey God's positive Law before that special covenant ) is false: For without doubt God's Dominion over the Earth, as he is stiled *Lord of all the Earth* frequently in Scripture, puts a duty, not only upon all the Seed of *Abraham*, but all the Seed of *Adam*, to obey his positive Law as well as the Moral Law, in case that positive Law be appropriated to them, either in general, or to any of them in particular, as the Ceremonial Law was appropriated to the *Jews*, and there needs no special contract to oblige any sort of Men to obey whatever God commands, for he is Lord and Creator of all the Earth, and the disposer and orderer of all things in it, and hath a right to do so, which Mr. *Hobbes* acknowledgeth, p. 187. and saith, 'Tis naturally

turally upon the account of his Power, that God reigneth and punisheth the breach of his Laws ; and this Mr. Hobbes saith without any limitation. So before I give a further answer in this, Mr. Hobbes must be reconciled to himself. But Mr. Hobbes goes on in this his fabrick , and after several Texts cited, that the Jews were God's peculiar people, boldly concludes, p. 218. *That by the Kingdom of God, is properly meant a Commonwealth instituted ( by consent of those that are to be subject thereto ) for their Civil Government ; which properly was a Kingdom , wherein God was King , and the High Priest his Viceroy.* And for this, thanks to his grace, he vouchsafeth a reason, ( which he never did that I remember before for any of his crotchets ) which is, *That the Jews in Scripture are called an Holy Nation.* Now *holy*, saith Mr. Hobbes , signifieth *that which is God's by special, not general right.* Put this into a Syllogism, and let us see how natural the consequence will be: By an holy Nation in Scripture is meant a peculiar Nation to God ; But the Jews are an holy Nation : Ergo by the Kingdom of God is properly meant a Commonwealth. If Mr. Hobbes

*Hobbes* had made this Syllogism, any one would swear that *Mr. Hobbes*, although he railed against *Aristotle*, had never read him, or else not understood him. And 'tis not less absurd out of a Syllogism, than 'tis in; for what hath an holy Nation, which are God's people because they serve him in the way of Piety, ( which respects mainly their future state ) to do with a Commonwealth, and God's being Monarch upon Earth, which he hath left in the Creation to the government of Men? But *Mr. Hobbes* p. 218. cites divers Texts of Scripture to confirm his Position; of which Texts I shall only answer two, which seem to bear most in his advantage, and the first is, *1 Sam. 12. 12.* where 'tis said, upon the *Israelites* desiring a King, that *God was their King*. Hence *Mr. Hobbes* collects, *That God was their King, and governed the Civil State of the Commonwealth, and that the high Priest was his Viceroy*. I shall agree with *Mr. Hobbes*, that God so far governed the State of the Commonwealth, as to appoint who should govern it; but 'tis most apparent, that he no otherwise govern'd it, than by appointing who should

should govern, as he doth in all Commonwealths, ( for *by him King's reign.* ) For there was a certain time when there was no King in *Israel*, and God appointed sometimes Judges, Chiefs, ( that is Kings ) to govern them : between which Judges there was intervals ; and I would know, what temporal Jurisdiction God exercised over them in those intervals, or at that time when there was no King : Certainly none that we ever read of in holy Writ, and 'tis reasonable to suppose God exercised none, for that the people of *Israel* were then grievously oppressed, and so continued sometimes forty Years, before a deliverer rose up ; which they needed not to have done, if God had undertaken the temporal government ; for that God by his Power was able to have deliver'd them, which we see he never did, but by a temporal Governor ; in the time of which Governor, the high Priest was not God's Viceroy, but rather the Governor's, and the 17. *Deut. 9. & 12. v.* clearly makes the Priest and the Judge, which should then afterwards be different persons, and different Employments. So 'tis most apparent, that God was no other-



otherwise the temporal King of the *Israelites*, than he was *King of all the Earth* ; nor the high Priest, as high Priest, his Viceroy ; though the *Israelites* were his chosen people, as to Religious worship. And as to the *1 Sam.* 8. 7. which Mr. *Hobbes* cites, where God said to *Samuel* ( when the people asked a King ) *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me ; that I should not rule over them* : it is no more, but that God was angry with them, for not taking such a Governor as he was pleased to set over them, as *Samuel* then was, and *Baruck*, *Jephtha*, and *Samson* had been ; but that they would have one, not only of their own choosing, but also after the similitude of other Nations, which God had rejected, and had chosen them for his peculiar people ; and so in that sense they may be said to reject God, in that they rejected those he did set over them. As to Mr. *Hobbes* his other places of Scripture, I think them nothing to the matter, and so I shall pass them over, as he saith he doth many more places for this purpose not cited, but instead of citing them slyly ( as I think ) claps his hands at the  
Clergy,

Clergy, p. 219. and saith, *'Tis a wonder no more notice is taken of this, but that it gives too much light to Christian Kings to see their right of Ecclesiastical government.* To this I will answer for the Clergy of *England*, that those that are not infected with a spice of Popery, as I am afraid some such there are, (God make them fewer) or some for want of due consideration, always acknowledge the King for supream Head of the Church, and by that Title pray for him, and not by that sleighty Title of *Supream Moderator* of the Church; and the *English* Clergy, if some few do otherwise, are no more to be blamed for this, than the *English* Souldiers were in the blessed Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* to be blamed in *Holland*, because *Stanly* and *York* delivered Towns up to the *Spaniard*; or *English* Writers, because one *English Man* hath written such a Book as the *Leviathan*, who after his Learned Discourse of the Kingdom of God comes to tell us, p. 219. what the Kingdom of Grace is, and saith, *Those are in it that promise obedience to God's government* (I suppose he means temporal of which he hath been treating before) *to whom*, saith he,  
God

*God hath gratis given to be his Subjects hereafter, which is called the Kingdom of Glory.* Now certainly the Kingdom of Grace, by all Men before Mr. *Hobbes*, was taken to be God's Spiritual government; which he exerciseth in the Hearts of good Men, by his commands, threats, and promises; to which if they yield obedience, in and through the mercies of our blessed Saviour they are made inheritors of the Kingdom of Glory. And what a quibble this is of Mr. *Hobbes*, from the word *gratis* to change the sence of the Kingdom of Grace, I shall refer to any intelligent person.

Mr. *Hobbes* coming in his 36. *Chapter* to treat of the Word of God and the Prophets, comes to shew what *word* signifies in Scripture; of which I do think he hath given a true account in several Texts, but is not able in any kind of Truth to hold out long: For p. 224. he saith, *That the word of God, in several Texts of Scripture, signifies* (which I never observed in any) *such words as are consonant to the dictates of right Reason*; and the first Text he cites is 2 *Chron.* 35. 22. where 'tis said, *That*

Josiah *harkned not to the words of Necho from the mouth of God*; which, saith Mr. Hobbes, were but the *dictates of Reason*. This is most palpably unreasonable; for there was no reason for Josiah to forbear fighting with Necho ( the Kings of Judah having beaten as great Kings as the Kings of Egypt, and the Jews being then in a powerful condition ) when he came into his Country with a great Army. So this Text must either be intended, that the words of Necho were but what God had told him, or that they were revealed to Josiah to be God's mind by some Prophet, which most Interpreters take to be Jeremiah; nay Mr. Hobbes himself cites Esdras for this last Interpretation, but saith, *That in this he approves not an Apocryphal writer*; though before, when he had a mind to invalidate the Scriptures, by making the Penmen of them uncertain, seemed strongly to incline, that Esdras was the Penman of them after the Captivity, ( when it might be supposed the certain Truth was lost ) and that only from the Authority of the Book of Esdras; whose Authority, or rather Interpretation, he here rejects.

And

And then Mr. *Hobbes* goes on to cite several other Texts of Scripture to prove, that in Scripture by the *Word of God* is meant the *dictates of Reason or Equity*, as *Jerem. 31. 33.* and other places, where God saith, *He will write his Laws in their Hearts.* Which places, by all other Men I think, have been interpreted the *operation of God's Spirit upon the minds of Men*, by inclining them to obey his Laws, after God had taught them by his Prophets or Ministers. And there is no cause to call that *reason*, or the *proceed of reason*, which the Scripture terms the *operation of God*. A Man bringing reason ( or an aptitude to it ) into the World, and so he doth not that which God effects in him after he is in the World.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 238. saith, *That a private Man hath Power to believe, or not believe Miracles, Thought being free; but, saith he, when it comes to publick confession, the private reason must submit to the publick.* Now by his Rule, though a Man do not believe lying wonders, yet he may say he doth, if any one will believe Mr. *Hobbes*. In short, this is much like his precedent Doctrine of practice, and

serves to authorise the grossest hypocrisie in the World, in case the publick, which he calls *God's Lieutenant*, say contrary to his belief. This will make Mr. *Hobbes* safe, either in *Turky*, though he be a *Christian*; or at *Rome*, though he be a *Protestant*. Yet Mr. *Hobbes* ought to remember, that in holy Scripture; *belief in the Heart*, and *confession with the Mouth*, go together. But this conceit of Mr. *Hobbes* puts me in mind of a story of *Bernier's*, a *French Man*, who when he travail'd into the *Mozol's* Country, happening to be Physician to *Danech-Men-Kan*, chief Minister of State, was sent by him to see a *Mahometan* Miracle, and discovering the cheat of it (which the Priests of that Temple observing) was forced to cry, *Wonder, Wonder*, as the custom there is, in token of assent, and immediately to take Horse, for fear of being knock'd on the Head because of his discovery. Now that which *Bernier* did do out of present fear, Mr. *Hobbes* here gives an expresse toleration for, and lays it down as universally lawful. Of this I shall say no more, only refer my reader to my Lord of *Clarendon* upon this place, who hath exposed him sufficiently.

After

After Mr. *Hobbes* hath been labouring to make Religion *nothing*, the authority of the Scriptures *doubtful*, and endeavouring to deprive God of the *honour* of his *greatest* ( if any excel ) *attributes*. Now in his 38. *Chapter* he comes to deprive Man of his *hopes* of a great part of his *eternal felicity*, and saith, *p. 239.* concerning the place wherein Men shall enjoy eternal life, which Christ hath obtained for them, *That several Texts* ( he there cites ) *seem to make it on Earth*: which afterwards he concludes upon, *p. 241.* with the *mortality of the Soul* till the Resurrection. I must confess, that I wonder that any Man in his wits should raise such an opinion from Texts that look nothing like it, which I will refer to any sober Man. So I shall not trouble my self with any of them, save the 3<sup>d</sup> of *John* 13. which saith, *That no Man hath ascended up into Heaven, but the Son of Man, which came down from Heaven.* Whereupon Mr. *Hobbes* saith, *That by the way he observes, that these are not the words of our Saviour, though the words before are, but of St. John himself; for Christ was not then in Heaven.* And now the implication

from this, as I suppose is, that if none but Christ shall ascend ( which is meant by *hath ascended* in this place, Christ being then on Earth ) then the place of eternal Life for Men shall be on Earth. This looks pretily, but hath nothing of an objection in it against Man's going into Heaven for eternal Happiness; when the Text is compared with what went before in the *Chapter*. For there was a discourse between our Saviour and *Nicodemus* about his being born again, and *Nicodemus* asked, *how these things should be?* Our Saviour replies, *vers. 12. If you believe not when I tell you Earthly things, how will you believe when I tell you of Heavenly things?* And then comes the *13th verse*, which saith, *No Man hath ascended, &c.* which are plainly the words of our Saviour, being they refer to the precedent discourse; and are no more than if our Saviour had said, No man can tell these Heavenly things which I speak of ( and 'tis like were mysteries belonging to the Kingdom of God not to be revealed ) save my self, who came down from Heaven, when I took the humane Nature upon me. And 'tis not improbable, that he spake



spake this to give *Nicodemus* to understand, that he was God as well as Man. And as to Mr. *Hobbes* his other Texts to prove, *That the future state of the blessed shall be upon Earth*; I think them only set down for number or sound sake, and so I shall pass them over. And as to the Text in *Job* to prove the *mortality of the Soul*, till the Resurrection, 'tis this, *That Man lieth down, and riseth not till the Heavens be no more*. Which receives a short answer (*viz.*) that 'tis meant only of the Body of Man. But now to confute Mr. *Hobbes*, I shall only lay down some few Texts of Scripture. First, as to the place of happiness eternal, to prove that it is in Heaven, and that our Bodies may ascend thither, as 'tis plain the Bodies of *Enoch* and *Elias* have already done, and why not ours as well as theirs? And *1 Thes. 4. 17.* saith, *That we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them* (that is, the dead in Christ as the verse precedent expresseth it) *in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord*. How shall we be with the Lord; upon Earth? No 'tis plain in the Heavens, which is signified by the

I 4      clouds;

clouds; and this further shews the possibility of our Bodies ascending; for the Text saith expressly, joyned with the precedent verse, *That we shall be caught up in the clouds.* I shall cite but one Text more, and so leave Mr. Hobbes and his new opinion to stare one upon another: It is 2 Corin. 5. 1. where the Apostle saith, *For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the Heavens.* This is so full in all the parts of it aginst Mr. Hobbes, that I think it impossible for any evasion to be made out of it in behalf of Mr. Hobbes his opinion. But Mr. Hebbes, though he be unkind to the Saints, is very kind to the wicked, ( and this I think ought to be ranked in the front of his Domestic Politics ) for he saith, p. 242. *That Earth is the place for the damned:* And p. 243. saith, *That fire in Scripture, which is mentioned as a punishment in several Texts, is to be taken metaphorically, and may be exprest in proper terms; which, he saith, p. 244. is no more but vexation of mind to see others happy, and that the condemned person shall not be ever in it, but dye, never*

*to live again.* ( And now Mr. *Hobbes* living or dying may think he hath made himself a safe bargain. ) What can more incourage wicked Men to go on in their sins than this? Or not to value, whether they assent or no to Mr. *Hobbes* his damnable Doctrines, both of belief and practice? But the rational or argumentative part of this I shall pass over, because my Lord of *Clarendon* hath said so much upon this matter, and only cite some few Texts of Scripture, to satisfy any Man that the place of future torment is not upon Earth, and that the Soul of Man is immortal, whether it be the Soul of a wicked person, or a righteous, as well before as after the resurrection. The first is *Matth.* 5. 30. which saith, *'Tis better that one of thy members perish than that thy whole body should be cast into Hell, ( and the wicked shall be turn'd into Hell, and all the Nations that forget God )* which, as the Learned Mr. *Hobbes* saith, is as much as should be cast upon the Earth, where 'tis already. And to shew that there is now, and was then, such a place as Hell, look *Prov.* 15. 11. where 'tis said, *that Hell and destruction are before the eyes*

*eyes of the Lord*, that is, he knows what the wicked there suffer. To end this, see *Mark* 9. 44, 46, 48. where 'tis said, *the worm dieth not*, ( that is the lash of Conscience ) *and the fire is not quenched*; speaking of a Man's being cast into Hell. So then, if the worm dies not, the subject of that worm must live, that is, the wicked person; and the fire of Hell is said to be as everlasting; For 'tis *not quenched*, which must be intended never shall be quenched. And to stop Mr. *Hobbes* his Mouth, as to the eternity of punishment and reward, look *Matth.* 25. 46. *These shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* And that the Soul lives after the death of the Body until the resurrection, see, *Eccel.* 12. 7. where *Solomon* speaking of Man's dissolution, saith, *The dust* ( that is the Body ) *shall return to the Earth, and the Spirit to God that gave it.* And *Acts* 7. 59. *Stephen* when stoned said, *Lord Jesus receive my Spirit.* These two Texts must be intended of living Spirits, for what should God do with dead Spirits, which are nothing, who is God of the living, and not of the dead? None of which Texts Mr.

*Hobbes*

*Hobbes* takes any notice of, save that in *Mark* of the worm not dying. To which he saith, 'tis *metaphorically to be understood*; and this answer would serve for any thing else, as well as this. I shall pass the rest of *Mr. Hobbes* his absurdities in this *Chapter* about these matters, save one at the latter end, where he jumps again into setting the place of Men's eternal happiness upon Earth, and p. 246. cites *Isaiah* 33. v. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. to be full in the matter; which is so far from the matter, that it is only Scripture to signify God's destruction of the *Affyrians*, and the *Jews* deliverance from them. But whether the punishment be by fire, or without, I shall not argue, (though the Texts say it is, which are better authority than ever I heard to the contrary) only I hope no Man will venture upon the punishment which is everlasting, *Matth.* 25. 46. presuming upon *Mr. Hobbes* his assertions to be true. Neither do I think any good Man will think the merits of our blessed Lord and Saviour the less, for what *Mr. Hobbes* in this *Chapter* saith, who after he hath been endeavouring to make all Religion a foppery, to set up  
Idola-

Idolatrous worship, to debase our Saviour in respect of his miracles, to make the credibility of the Scriptures questionable, to deprive God of his Attributes, now comes p. 248. to undervalue the sufferings of our Saviour; and saith, *That the sufferings of our Saviour were no satisfaction or price for sin, whereby Christ could claim right to a pardon for us from his offended Father, but that price that God in mercy was pleased to demand.* And this he further explains himself in, p. 261. I acknowledge that the sufferings of our Saviour were all that God demanded as a satisfaction for sin, but when our Saviour had performed what God did require, it was an absolute satisfaction. And this is clear reason in the transactions of Men: when the debt is paid by ones self, or an other, or that is paid that is required, there is a full satisfaction, and the prisoner, or he that paid the debt may of right claim his discharge. So may Christ of right claim a pardon for us from his Father, when the satisfaction for sin is paid: For although there was no reason that our Saviour should suffer for us, but meer mercy, as 'twas God's mercy to accept  
of

of Christ in our stead; yet 'tis great Reason, that when he hath suffered for our sins, he should of right claim to have us delivered from the punishment of them. And he was the true *scape-goat* that carried all our sins into the Land of forgetfulness. And *Matth. 1. 21. He shall save his people from their sins*, that is, by his merits defend them from his Father's wrath: With which Text agrees *18. Matth. 11. 1 Tim. 1. 15. He came to save sinners*; and multitudes of Texts to this purpose. And besides, God when he first promised Christ to mankind said, *That he should break the serpent's head*; that is, by his own efficacy, for he was God as well as Man, and that gave power to effect, and value to satisfy. But Mr. *Hobbes* his conceit had been good, in case that after a sinner had lain in Hell seven years, God had said, this is enough, and had freed him. Here 'tis true the sinner could not have claimed a right to a pardon for what he had suffered, but that suffering was all that God was pleased in mercy to demand; for that a sinner can never make a full satisfaction for his sin. But here we cannot but suppose

suppose God the Father and his Innocent Son as it were making (I speak it with reverence) a contract: The Father as it were saying, *If you'l suffer, I will take it as a satisfaction for Man's sin;* And his Son saying, *I will* (for he voluntarily laid down his life, it was not taken from him, and those sufferings God would not dispense with) *suffer for sinners, or in their stead.* Certainly now he hath suffered, he may of right claim a pardon for sinners. But as to this matter I wave further Discourse, there being so many Treatises upon it.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 250, 251. saith, *That the Israelites obligation to obey Moses, was only from their desire and promise at mount Sinai, Exod. 20. 18. where they said, speak thou to us, and we will hear; but let not God speak to us, lest we die.* Certainly any rational Man would wonder at such a fancy, when 'tis apparent, that *Moses* was God's messenger by the many miracles wrought by his Hands, both in *Egypt*, from whence he led them, and at the *red Sea*, where they were miraculously saved and the *Egyptians* drowned, and by many other miracles before they came to  
mount



mount *Sinai*. And upon that account ( as so apparently sent by God ) they were bound to obey *Moses*; or disobey God himself; and this promise at mount *Sinai* was only to free them from the terror they had undergone before. But that which Mr. *Hobbes* drives at in this conceit may be to persuade Men, that they need not obey any of the Prophets, Apostles, or Ministers of the Gospel, since, without their express promise so to do. And so further labours to enervate the authority of the Scriptures and Gospel Ministry. But as Mr. *Hobbes* gave *Moses* a smaller authority in this than one would have expected, so in p. 252. he gives him and all succeeding Monarchs a greater trouble than 'tis reasonable to impose upon them; For he saith, *That all Sovereigns are the sole interpreters of God's commands, and that no man ought to proceed further in the interpretation of Scripture, than the Sovereign limits.* So that a Sovereign ought to be either a more exact Divine than ever I heard of in the World, to interpret all places of Scripture that a question is demanded of, or else of a most exact and quick Judgment, to limit  
 others

others how far they shall go. And suppose a Sovereign prove a fool, or like an ill Steersman always turning the boat round, uncertain in his resolves; who must interpret the matter then? But I shall pass this over without more saying, as one of the chances of Mr. Hobbes his fancy.

Mr. Hobbes p. 263. saith, *That the end of Our Saviour's coming into the World was to restore unto God the Kingdom, cut off from him by the rebellion of the Israelites in the election of Saul.* So far he hath renounced all Salvation by Christ. But to do him right, he saith afterwards, *That our Saviour had an other imploy, and that was to Preach that he was the Messiah, and in case the Nation of the Jews should refuse him, then to call to his obedience the Gentiles.* So now he seems only by the accident of the Jews refusal, to exclude them from Salvation, and by the same accident only to make the Gentiles capable of mercy. Now is any thing more plain in the World, than that he came into the World to satisfy God's justice for the sins of the World, and with intent to bring in the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and to make

make them one sheepfold under himself the great Shepherd? And that appears from the first promise of him, *viz. That the Seed of the Woman should break the Serpents Head*, that is, should take away that misery from the Seed of the Woman, which the subtilty of the Serpent had brought upon it; and I suppose Mr. *Hobbes* will not say amidst his new found unreasonable Doctrines, That the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews* were not the off-spring of *Eve*. And he was the blood of the everlasting covenant, and the great Shepherd of the Sheep spoken of *Heb. 13. 20.* And *John 1. 29.* he is called the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the World; and this was before he was rejected by the *Jews*. And all the Prophecies of our Saviour in the Old Testament express our Saviour's bringing in the *Gentiles*, and the intent of God to do so, as *Isaiah 49. 22.* *I will lift up my Hand to the Gentiles, and set up my Standard to the People*; and this was before our Saviour's coming into the World. Texts for this I shall cite no more, it being a thing so plain against Mr. *Hobbes*; and one would wonder ever such conceits without ground or

reason should come into any Man's Head.

Mr. *Hobbes*, after a great deal of stir about the Trinity, and the Unity of that Trinity, which is hard to make any thing of, or rather impossible, by reason his opinion was concealed, comes p. 268. to tell us his opinion in these words following (*viz.*) *To conclude, saith he, the Doctrine of the Trinity, as far as can be gathered directly from the Scripture, is in substance this: That the God who is always one and the same, was the person represented by Moses, the person represented by his Son incarnate, and the person represented by the Apostles: As represented by the Apostles, the Holy Spirit by which they spake is God; as by Moses, the Father is God; as represented by his Son, (that was God and Man) the son is God. These are his very words. So observe, he absolutely denies in this the personal existence of the two last Persons in the Trinity. And 'tis in short to say, as others have said before me, that there is but one Person under different conceptions. And the inference is direct and natural; for, saith Mr. *Hobbes*, *God was in three respects represented*, which excludes the real existence of three Divine*

vine Persons in the Godhead, and only supposeth three Persons that represented this one God, not that there are three Persons in the Godhead, or that are God; for no one is said to represent, that is the Person represented. Now to illustrate this, the King of *England* is represented by the Lord Deputy of *Ireland*, by the Viceroy of *Scotland*, and by his Governor of the Island of *Jersey*; But still 'tis the energy of the one Person of the King that actuates them all, and there are not three Persons of the King, nor any of those three Persons are the King; no more are there three Persons in the Godhead, if we will believe Mr. *Hobbes*, who makes the three Persons in the Trinity, but three Names to express one only Person of God. So 'tis all one, as if he had said, the Son is not God as a distinct Person from the Father, but that the only one Person of the Godhead was come into Man; or at best had taken the Virgins Son into it; or, that he had said, the Person of the Holy Ghost was not God as a distinct Person from the Father, but that the only one Person of God inspired the Apostles. So then clearly

here is a denial of the two second Persons in the Trinity, for if there be only one Person, there is not three in the Trinity. But Mr. *Hobbes* in this hath the confidence to say, *That this his fancy is all that can be gathered from Scripture concerning the Trinity*: And that he may meet with his match, I will say the contrary; and I doubt not, but my authorities for my opinion will prove better than his. It is said in 1 *Joh. 5. 7. There are three bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* So this is clear, that the Godhead is three Persons, not as 'tis represented at three different times upon Earth, but as it is three distinct Persons in Heaven. So this makes an end of Mr. *Hobbes* his conceit, that there are only said to be three Persons in the Godhead, to be made out by Scripture in respect of the three representations upon Earth; for they are in this Text said to be *three in Heaven*, and all three are said to be in action, that is, *to bear record*, which shews they are several and distinct Persons. And the 3<sup>d</sup> of *Titus* 4, 5, 6. v. clearly shews the Trinity of the Persons really existent;

istent ; which Texts are (*viz.*) *After the love of God our Saviour toward Man appeared, By his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost : Which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.* Here is God the Father that saves his people by regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; and 'tis through Jesus Christ our Saviour; So what can be plainer (besides the Scriptures that speak of the descent and mission of the Holy Ghost) that the Godhead hath three Persons in it, in another manner than as it was represented by *Moses*; for here is God the Father fully set forth a part, that through mercy he saved us; and God the Holy Ghost in another manner set forth, than represented by the Apostles, for this is spoken of the renewing of the Holy Ghost in all believers; and Jesus Christ the meritorious cause of our Salvation, which he could not have been, but as he was both God and Man, and Mr. *Hobbes* calls him so in this Chapter. So that Christ, as Christ, Mr. *Hobbes* makes meer Man, (as he styles him and would make him, *Chap.* 38. though otherwise

calls him in this *Chapter* ) for he makes him only the representer of God, as *Moses* was; and the Holy Ghost Mr. *Hobbes* saith in effect, is *nothing*, for he saith that that denomination was attributed to God, as he was represented by the Apostles: So that the Holy Ghost was only an Attribute of God. But besides all this, Mr. *Hobbes* spoke before, upon his reliance upon the Church of *England* as to matters of Faith, and that the Civil Sovereign is to appoint what is to be taught for Doctrine. And the Church of *England*, and our Sovereigns, have establish'd *Athanasius* his Creed to be read, and as necessary to Salvation to be believed, and that Creed, as well as the beginning of the Litany, is expressly against Mr. *Hobbes*; for it saith, That *there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost*; which Creed and Litany speak them in themselves three distinct Persons, and as such are prayed to, without interesting *Moses* or the Apostles in the matter; and agree to my interpretation of Scripture. So for once I hope, without boasting, I may say I have got the better of Mr. *Hobbes*.

In-



Indeed this opinion of his is like the rest of the abominable and damnable whimsies of his own brain, and ought to be ranked in the front of them. And to give Mr. *Hobbes* a little over weight, I will refer it to any rational Man, whether *Mark* 1. 10. *Joh.* 1. 32. do not absolutely shew the distinction of the two second Persons in the Trinity; where 'tis said, That *the Spirit of God descended from Heaven like a Dove, and abode upon Christ.* Now taking Christ to be God, ( as Mr. *Hobbes* frequently calls him in this *Chapter* ) what was the Spirit that abode upon him, but a distinct Person in the Godhead, and *Heb.* 3. 7. conjoined to *Psal.* 95. 7. to which it relates, may fully conclude Mr. *Hobbes*: For the former Text saith, *That the Holy Ghost said, To day if ye will hear his voice;* which last words are the words of the latter Text in the 95. *Psal.* So 'tis apparent, that in *David's* time ( which I hope Mr. *Hobbes* will allow to be before the Apostles time ) there was an Holy Ghost. So I will leave Mr. *Hobbes*, in hopes he will live long enough to recant this opinion.

Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 282. *That the four first of the ten Commandments were particular to the Israelites, but the six latter obliged all mankind, being but the Law of Nature.* I shall agree with Mr. Hobbes, as to the six latter, that they are but what Nature dictated before; But as to the four first, I would know a reason, why they were not obligatory by the Law of Nature, at least secondarily; that is to say, obligatory by Nature upon all Men that know there was one, and only one living and true God, (as all Men may see there is by the things that he hath made) which knowledge makes it as natural, as to the three first Commands, for us to be bound by those Laws, as 'tis for a Man naturally to be bound not to injure his neighbour. As for Example, Is it not as natural for the Creature to worship his Creator, and not to set up false gods to deprive him of his honour, and not to use his Name irreverently, as 'tis for a Man not to desire or take that which is an other Mans? 'Tis more natural, if we will believe what Mr. Hobbes said before, (*viz.*) *That by Nature all Men were in an estate of Civil War, and might catch what they*

they could, and in that state, all force and fraud were cardinal Virtues; but certainly never was any state or condition so, where it was a cardinal Virtue to worship any god but the true one, or to be irreverent to his Name. But Mr. *Hobbes* his conceit is good in this place for one thing, and that is, that after he hath been blaspheming God, and taking from him his Attributes, and giving Men a toleration as to external acts, or confession, to acknowledge any thing for God; that here he gives a reason for all that he said, as to us *Gentiles*, for we may do or say what we will, not being *Jews*, in respect of God Almighty, for that there is no Law, if we will believe Mr. *Hobbes*, to oblige us *Gentiles* to the contrary; The four first Commands not being by the Law of Nature obligatory to any Man; and being particular to the *Israelites*, as made at mount *Sinai*. Now the Nature of a particular Law, is only to oblige that particular people for whom 'twas particularly made, and those were the *Israelites* in this case, if Mr. *Hobbes* be an authentick Author. And as to the fourth Command I think, though the day

day be changed, yet that in substance is as obligatory as the other three are by the Law of Nature; for 'tis as natural to set a time a part for the worship of God, as 'tis to worship him; and since God hath limited the *Jews* a whole day, why should not we take that as our pattern? For 'tis as natural to take God for our pattern in this, as in other things, (*Be ye holy as I am holy.*) And we have not only his Command to the *Jews* for a pattern, but his own Example of *resting the seventh day, and sanctifying it*; upon the knowledge of which, why should it not be natural for Men to keep holy one day in seven? For the Law of Nature is twofold, either primary, without any prerequisite, as 'tis natural for a thing that hath life to move: Or secondary, when something is requisite to give liberty to Nature to work; as for Example, Men love their Children naturally, but they must know first that they are their Children, before they love them as such: For if a Father had never seen his Child from his birth till ten years of age, and then should accidentally meet him, he would love him no better then any other;  
but

but after he was acquainted by undoubted circumstances that it was his Child, then naturally would result an emanation of affection: So after we know that there is only one God, and that he hath appointed one day in seven for his service, though to another people, ( which day he *sanctified* and *rested* upon, *Gen. 2. 3.* ) why is it not natural for us to serve him, ( all mankind having an inbred awe towards something above them ) and that on one day in seven, according to his example? Not but that I admit, that the fourth Command as to the precise seventh day was ceremonial, and is determin'd since the time of our Saviour.

Mr. *Hobbes*, after he hath denied the personal Divinity of our Saviour, now comes to tell us, p. 286. *That our Saviour, nor his Apostles, had any power to make Laws, and that they that broke any of his dictates, did not sin in it; but died in their sins, not being pardoned for their offences to the Laws of their respective Countries, or of Nature.* And for this he cites *John 3. 18.* which saith, *They are condemned already, not that they shall be condemned,* saith he. And this conceit Mr. *Hobbes* grounds

grounds upon our Saviours saying *his Kingdom is not of this world*, and he that hath no Kingdom, saith Mr. *Hobbes*, can make no Laws; so our Saviour's precepts obliged not. And now one would think Mr. *Hobbes* might rest satisfied; for after as he thought he had robbed Christ of his personal Godhead, now he robs him of his Authority to make Laws, and so all the wicked in the World are obliged to him for setting them free from the Gospel, in case they will but go into any part of the World to live where the Gospel of Christ, or his Apostles, are not made Canonical by the Law of that Country. But in short, to answer Mr. *Hobbes* is to give the true interpretation of the words of our Saviour, *Joh. 18. 36.* where he saith, *His Kingdom is not of this world*; which is no more, but that he designed not to take away the *Romans* Jurisdiction, in respect of the external acts and punishments of Men; but doth it therefore follow, that he that was *Lord of the whole Earth*, ( who Mr. *Hobbes* said before represented God ) had no power, by his Word and Doctrine to oblige the Consciences of those that submitted

ted  
tho  
tha  
ry  
upo  
15.  
spe  
it v  
obe  
and  
new  
love  
tho  
wor  
him  
rect  
fles  
Mr.  
man  
clea  
Law  
Con  
King  
by S  
to e  
we  
extr  
men  
to b

ted to the Truth of them, or to leave those without excuse that refused, and that under the penalty of eternal Misery? And that we may see that he took upon him to make Laws, look *Joh. 14. 15. 1 Joh. 2. 3. & 3. 22, 24.* which all speak of Christ's commands, and that it was the token of peoples love and obedience to him that they kept them; and in another place Christ saith, *A new command I give unto you, that ye love one another.* If Christ had no Authority to make Laws, why are his words called commands, even by him himself? For had they been only directions, or beseechings, he and the Apostles would have stiled them so. Nay, Mr. Hobbes saith, p. 308. *That the Command, is the stile of a Law.* So that 'tis clear our Saviour had power to make Laws, which he executed upon the Consciences of Men, which was the *Kingdom of Heaven at hand*, preached of by St. John, although he was not pleased to exercise a Temporal Jurisdiction, and we may suppose it was to shew the extraordinary Spirituality of his Government; in which sence he may be said to be King of the Jews, though his  
King-

Kingdom was not of this World. And as to Mr. *Hobbes* his Text out of *Joh. 3. 18.* whereby he would prove, that those that obeyed not Christ's commands were not guilty of a sin, but were condemned already for sin, as he saith, against Nature or the Laws of their Country; Mr. *Hobbes* cites so much of the Text, and no more than he thinks to his purpose, and 'tis one of the pitifullest shifts in all his Book; for the latter end of the verse saith, the words were spoken of Men condemned already *for not believing in Christ*, ( not for disobeying the Laws of their Country. ) Now who would trust such a juggler, that hath the confidence to cite part of a verse to prove that which the residue proves the contrary? But hence 'tis manifest that wicked Men and Seducers grow worse and worse.

And now Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 300. falls upon Cardinal *Bellarmino*, and continues battering of him many *pages* together, about the Supremacy of the Pope over the Church: I think it might be a greater question and harder to resolve, whether Cardinal *Bellarmino* or Mr. *Hobbes* was the archer Heretick: That making



making more God's than one, and this denying the one only God his Attributes, and the existency of two of the Persons in the Godhead: That being a Papist and the worshipper of false gods, as a Wafer-cake and Pictures, Angels and dead People; This a worshipper of no God at all, a Stock, or a Stone, when the Sovereign commands, or when he shall change a *Christian* for an *Heathenish* soil: That being obstinate in his Religion; and this ready to change, as to external acts, when the Sovereign bids him? This question I leave to better judgments to decide.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 323. saith, *That there is nothing in Scripture, from whence may be inferr'd the infallibility of the Church.* If Mr. *Hobbes* mean the particular Church of *Rome*, I shall agree with him; for as to so much as I know of it, 'tis as full of Errors and unreasonable Tenets as the *Quakers*, or Mr. *Hobbes* his Book: But as to Christ's Church in general, I would have Mr. *Hobbes* look *Ephes. 5. 35, 36, & 37. v.* and he will find that Christ hath *purified his Church, that it might be without spot, &c.* that is, without Error. And in the same Chapter he will

will find how Christ and his Church *are one*, as a Man and his Wife are, and that Christ *loves it* and *cherisheth it*; which either must be intended in keeping it from Errors, or I know not what those Texts signifie. For if Christ suffer it to run into Error, it will be ruined or run into decay; and God will deal with it, as he threatned to the particular Churches in the *Revelations*, except they did amend. And Christ saith, *Matth. 16. 18. That the gates of Hell should not prevail against it.* And *1 Tim. 3. 15. calls the Church the pillar and ground of the Truth.* Besides many more Texts of this kind; but these are sufficient to shew Mr. *Hobbes* his confidence, or ignorance, to say, *That the Scripture contained nothing in it from whence might be inferr'd the infallibility of the Church:* see then how dangerous it is to believe Mr. *Hobbes*. Yet from this Position he infers in the next page, *That Christians do not know the Scriptures to be the Word of God, only believe it.* He might as well have said, that *Christians* do not know that there is a God, only believe it, and 'tis like this he may aim at: Or he might have said,

said, that I know not ( having never travell'd thither ) there is such a place as *Spain*, only believe it. One part of this Proposition of Mr. *Hobbes* is true, (*viz.*) *That the Scriptures are believed to be the Word of God.* But the ignorance of Mr. *Hobbes* lies in this, That in matters of fact, which our senses have not perceived, or we have not been at the transaction or institution of, the best evidence the thing is capable of (that is, unquestionable testimony) is sufficient to make us know, and that in such things knowledge and belief are the same. As when we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.* It is the same with, *I know that there is such a person in the Trinity as God the Father, and so of the rest of our Creed.* But when we have not had full testimony, and something may be for ought we know undiscovered that may alter the matter, then belief and knowledge are no more the same than *Is* and *may be*. But to make Mr. *Hobbes* the example in the matter, we will suppose that he before a pardon had been indicted of high Treason for endeavouring

L                      ring

ring to subvert by his Book the anti-ent Government of this Nation, both in respect of the Subjects subjection to their King, and the Peoples properties; and twelve Men had been of the Jury in *Middlesex*, none of which we will suppose stood by when he wrote the Book, but had testimony, all that the matter was capable of, to prove that he did write it, and there-upon the Jury had found him guilty; and Mr. *Hobbes* had had Judgment accordingly; certainly he would have thought, that the belief of the Jury; and the knowledge of the Jury in this matter had been the same. The case differs not (*mutato nomine*) as to the Scriptures, for that we believe and know them to be the Word of God, they having been delivered to us by unquestionable persons, and all the Testimony the thing is capable of. But of this I said a little before, and to avoid a tedious Discourse, shall refer my Reader for a perfect satisfaction to the Learned Dr. *Stillingsfleet's Origines Sacrae*, and to one of the Sermons of the Excellent Dr. *Tillotson*, another of our

our not only Learned, but firm Protestant Divines; who are the rather to be regarded, because they have neither feared to stand the Ire of a cloud full charged with Popery, or provided themselves (by an halting Sermon) a shelter against the rain: whose contrary are enough not only to fright Christians from the Altar, but to make Men abhor the offerings of the Lord: And if any such be that will not repent, let them not despair, but dye.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 324. saith, *That the only Article of Faith, which the Scripture makes necessary to Salvation, is this, that Jesus is the Christ.* If an other Man had said this, I should have taken little notice of it, because I should have supposed that he had meant, that Christ was the *corner Stone* and *Captain of our Salvation.* But I doubt Mr. Hobbes saith this to incourage Men in Idleness and Ignorance, which the Papists say is the Mother of Devotion. And though Mr. Hobbes was so much against *Bellarmino* in his last Chapter, yet he is so much a Papist in this ( that he

L 2

may

may taste of all Errors ) that he uses but the same saying here that Papists use against Reading of the Scriptures, and whether he intend it so far, or that the notion was set down by chance, is doubtful. But 'tis plain in our Creed, ) and by the Doctrine of our Church, which Mr. *Hobbes* allows of ) that there are other points necessary to Salvation besides this. As we must believe in God the Father and the Holy Ghost as well as in God the Son ; and this Mr. *Hobbes* acknowledgeth in p. 328. only under his own limitations, which are hard to be understood. But then p. 331. he strains my Faith upon one Article he lays down ; For he saith, *That he hath in all his Treatise of Christian Politicks, now run through, alledged no Text of scripture, but in such sence as is most agreeable to the scope of the Bible ;* which I confess I cannot believe, or if he believes himself I shall change my opinion of him, and instead of thinking him the grandest Heretick, think him the weakest person that ever laid pen to paper, or at least that ever had any reputation  
in

in the World, for so doing; except it be admitted me, that he is given up to believe a lye in matters of Religion; and I pray God he be not.

Mr. *Hobbes* after his saying, p. 244. *That the punishment of the damned should not be everlasting*, now he comes to p. 343. and goes over it again, (the fear of the contrary I doubt running in his mind) and begins to interpret Scripture concerning the immortality of the Soul in general, which he saith, may have an other interpretation than is usual, and first cites the 12. *Eccles.* 7. which saith, *Dust to dust, and the Spirit to God that gave it*; which, saith Mr. *Hobbes*, ought to be interpreted, *That God only knows what becomes of Man's Spirit, and not Man*; and so of another Text he cites. Hence he infers, *That because God only knows what becomes of Man's Spirit, that therefore the Spirit of Man lives not after the death of the Body till the resurrection.* First, The Interpretation is expressly against the Text, and absurd. Secondly, The Inference is nonsense; for doth it follow, that because God

L 3                      knows

knows where the Spirit of Man is, that therefore 'tis not with God himself? It is just as if I should say to a Man, you know where your coat is, and from thence I should infer, that he hath it not upon his back. So I hope no Body will much heed his interpretation of Scripture. But then p. 345. he tells us, *That in the resurrection, the Righteous shall have glorious and spiritual Bodies, and eternal; but saith, that 'tis not manifest by Scripture that the wicked shall have glorious and spiritual Bodies, or that they shall be as the Angels of God, neither Eating, nor Drinking, nor Ingenering, or that their life shall be eternal; and so the reprobate, saith he, shall be in the estate Adam was in after he had sinned, and Marry and give in Marriage, only shall have no Redeemer.* I hope now Mr. Hobbes hath perfected his safe bargain he before had begun, let his opinions be never so gross as to God and Religion; for he shall be still upon Earth and in no worse a condition than Adam was in after his fall, and that was, for ought we know, free from



from torment, or indeed any trouble of mind, save fear, and only at the time when he heard God in the Garden. But Mr. *Hobbes* hath not I thank him left us so much in the dark, for he goes on to the particulars of the future torment, *which*, he saith, *are eating and drinking* ( I suppose he means an appetite to eat and drink, when he hath no Money in his pocket ) *and ingendring*: I suppose he means, that he is cruelly afraid of a luxurious Wife, or else that he hath been unneighbourly dealt with in his Youth, and is afraid of the same hereafter: For otherwise cannot I imagin the torment of eating and drinking and ingendring. And further he goes on, and saith, *That the wicked shall not always personally be in this torment, but dye after a time, and their Children shall succeed in the same torments.* And all this he seems to collect from *Luke 20. v. 34, 35, 36.* which saith, *The Children of this world marry, but they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world neither marry, nor dye any more.* Hence he infers, *That because the Children of this*

*world* ( that is people now alive ) *do*  
*marry, and those in Heaven do not mar-*  
*ry, that therefore the reprobate* ( which  
 he would have understood by the  
 Children of this World ) *may marry :*  
 which is nonsense, and without ground :  
 'tis true that wicked Men in Scripture  
 are termed the *Children of this world,*  
 but they are not those that are al-  
 ready in Hell, but those that are like-  
 ly to be so except they repent. And  
 observe further, from the last mentio-  
 ned Text, which saith *That the righte-*  
*ous dye not ;* that he infers from thence,  
*That the wicked must dye in a future*  
*state.* This sufficiently exposeth it self.  
 But the substance of this his Dis-  
 course I have answered in speaking to  
 his 38. *Chapter,* which I now for that  
 cause pass over ; and for that my Lord  
 of *Clarendon* hath spoken something to  
 this, which I have omitted. But on-  
 ly this let me say, that I hope no Bo-  
 dy will be encouraged into a wicked  
 life, presuming Mr. *Hobbes* saith true,  
 in respect of the smalness or rather no  
 punishment hereafter ; for 'tis apparent  
 in this, that he hath talk'd like a mad-  
 man,

man, and in few places of his Book hath he in matters of concern spoken true.

Mr. Hobbes, Chapter 45. drawing near an end of this wicked Work, is drawn so dry, that he is forc'd upon repetitions, and falls again upon the Philosophy of Sight which he had spoken of in the beginning of his Book; and saith, *That for want of his understanding in it, the Jews, and all the rest of the world, have been mistaken about Dæmons, and then falls again to the corporeity of Spirits, which I have answered before. And here I shall observe a notable Collection of Mr. Hobbes, from a Text of Scripture which saith, that the Jews said to our Saviour, Thou hast a Devil. Hence he seems to infer, that there was no such thing as Devils (because our Saviour had none) in any of those our Saviour is said to cast the Devil out of, but that it was a mistake of the Jews; and those people said to have Devils were only troubled with some extraordinary or ill Disease. So, see this Learned Gentleman holds his old method of arguing,*  
That

That because our Saviour had not a Devil, therefore no other Man had, and because the wicked Jews were mistaken, as to our Saviour's having a Devil, that therefore the good Jews and Penmen of the Scripture, were mistaken, as to any one else having a Devil. But this I pass, having spoken to it before, only by the way observe, that Mr. Hobbes coming again to Spirits saith, *That the meaning of our Saviour's being led by the Spirit into the wilderness, and his carrying from place to place, was a vision:* So Mr. Hobbes, against the letter of so many Texts, condemns the opinion of all Divines I ever met with, just as a little before all Philosophers about Op-ticks.

Mr. Hobbes, p. 360. saying, *That 'tis not Idolatry to pay Divine worship to a King, if he command it by terror of punishment (which I have spoken to before) saith here, That 'tis no casting a stumbling block before his Brother, for that his Brother cannot argue from thence, that he, let him be never so wise and Learned, approves it, but doth it for fear,*  
(though

( though to do Mr. *Hobbes* right he in p. 362. saith the contrary.) One would wonder, that any Man that admits of such a thing as a stumbling block in his Brother's way, in a Religious sence, and that was not distracted, should say so; for what can be a greater encouragement to another to be Idolatrous, than his seeing his Wise and Learned neighbour do the thing. Certainly it cannot be supposed, that there can be a greater, and 1 *Cor.* 8. 10, 11, 12. v. is expressly against Mr. *Hobbes*; which saith, That *the weak Brother, seeing one sit at meat in the Idols Temple, is emboldned to eat things offered to Idols, whereby he may perish*; which is there said to be a sin against Christ. And how shall a Man know ( admitting it was lawful, as 'tis not, to be Idolatrous upon the account of fear ) whether it be done for fear, or no. 'Tis generally impossible, and not to be supposed. And Mr. *Hobbes*, in this page, prosecuting his Idolatrous Doctrine, saith, *That to worship God in a peculiar place, or to turn a Man's face to an Image or determinate place, is not to worship*

worship the Image or place ; but to acknowledge it holy , *that is* , set apart from common use ; and is not Idolatry , except done by a private authority. I would now have any Man living tell me , whether any Papist ever said more ( as much as Mr. *Hobbes* is against *Bellarmino* ) in justification of their using of Pictures or Crucifixes , or the Heathens of their falling down before Stocks and Stones , than he hath here done ; for my part I never did. For I never heard , but that the Papists say they use them to put them in mind ; and the Heathens , as I have read , say , That they do not imagin that Stocks or Stones can do them any good , as gods , or that they are gods. But if this , allowed by Mr. *Hobbes* , be not Idolatry , I would know what is , and against the second Command. But Mr. *Hobbes* here implies a Learned distinction , for he saith , *This is Idolatry* , *if the Image be used by private Authority* ; but I suppose he means , 'tis not Idolatry if set up by publick Authority. For he instances where 'twas lawful , upon the appointment of God Almighty,

ty, ( which he said before was King of *Israel* ) and saith, 'tis no more Idolatry, than it was for the *Israelites* before the brazen Serpent to worship God, or for the Jews to turn their faces towards Jerusalem, or for Moses to put off his shoes, or for people to worship God in the Churches. ~ x x x x x x x x x x

~ Mr. *Hobbes* did well to condemn *Aristotle*, for that *Aristotle* hath taught his Scholars to condemn Mr. *Hobbes*. For such consequences did never Man in *Bethlehem* put together, as he hath in this Book frequently, and particularly here. For doth it follow, because God, the Law maker, can dispense by his Word with any of his Commands, as this of the second Command, ( admit the instances Mr. *Hobbes* puts would hold ) that therefore any Authority upon Earth can, which was not the Law maker: This is to make Man in God's stead. And in a familiar instance to say, that because the King, Lords, and Commons, can by an Act dispense with a Law, or make one particular action Legal acted against that Law; that therefore every Master of a Family  
can

can do it; which consequences are absurd. And he might as well have said, that because God might lawfully command *Abraham* to kill his Son, that therefore a King may lawfully command any of his Subjects to do the same. But the instances Mr. *Hobbes* useth are not to his purpose; for the *Israelites* were only to look up to the *brazen Serpent* ( when stung ) by God's command, and this God made the means of their cure, as he might have made the looking up to an Oak Tree to have been, and there was no worshipping of God before it allowed, that ever we read of; nay<sup>r</sup>, after the *Israelites* burnt Incense to it, it was broken to pieces. And *Moses* putting off his shoes was likewise by God's particular command, upon a particular occasion; as likewise God made a particular grant to *Solomon* for the peoples praying with their faces towards the Temple, when they should be in a strange Land; and the worshipping in Churches is but going into a convenient place to serve God, which is set apart for that purpose. Now then let  
any



let any one judge, whether it be lawful for any person upon Earth to authorize the use of Images in the worship of God, from that which Mr. *Hobbes* hath said; and whether setting an Image apart for Divine worship be not Idolatry within the second Command, let it be done by any Authority whatever. 'Tis plain against the second Command, and no Authority can Authorize it.

Mr. *Hobbes*, coming in his 46. Chapter to the Kingdom of darkness, makes much of it to consist (which one would not easily have dream'd of) in Philosophy; and particularly rails against *Aristotle*, and takes his antient privilege to say this without giving the least shadow of reason: perchance hoping to make himself all the World over as great as *Aristotle* is in Oxford, and to bring in a new word of confutation (*viz.*) *Hobbes's ipse dixit*. But methinks he deals severely with Philosophy, to hang, draw and quarter it, by saying 'tis guilty of frightening Men from obeying the Laws of their native Country, as he doth p. 373. without telling

telling why; which with submission to Mr. *Hobbes* is a falser measure of Justice, than ever I knew the Lawyers use; for they hear a Delinquent, and tell him a reason why they condemn him. But this is to shew Mr. *Hobbes* a dextrous *Mahometan*, that after he hath indeavoured to extirpate all true Religion, now, as in other places, he would do as much for humane Learning, or else he would never call Philosophy the *subject of the Kingdom of darknes*. And in this *Chapter* he comes to the debate again, how fire should work upon a Soul: Whether it will or no, I shall not determin, and the possibility of it I have answered before, and so pass this over.

Mr. *Hobbes*, p. 377. to shew himself as Erroneous in Politicks, as he hath hitherto proved in Divinity or Philosophy, tells us, *That 'tis an other of Aristotles sayings (viz.) That in a well ordered Commonwealth, not Men should govern, but the Laws.* And from this Mr. *Hobbes* railing at the absurdity, infers, *That words and paper affright no Body, but the Hands and Swords of Men.*  
And

And from this I collect, that 'tis not convenient for Mr. *Hobbes* to write any more Books of Controvesie, till he grow better at a distinction. For 'tis true, that the Law is a Politic thing, and can act nothing of it self, without something that is natural conjoined to it; but notwithstanding 'tis properly called the Action of the Law, though the Execution be by Men's Hands; because 'tis the Authority of the Law that impowers them; and through its efficacy they are justified in their actions. As a Corporation, which is a thing of Politic institution, can really act nothing, yet notwithstanding the act of those they empower, is said to be their act, though done by others Hands. And 'tis plain what *Aristotle* (if he say so, as I believe he doth, 'tis so well said) means, *viz.* That a well ordered Commonwealth is governed, not by the uncertain will of the Sovereign, but by Laws establish'd by the Sovereign power to make Laws; in which consists, as my Lord of *Clarendon* hath shewn, the greatest happiness both of Prince and People. If Mr. *Hobbes* said this out of ignorance I am sorry for him; but if he said it to

M cologue

cologue with *Oliver's Army* in 1651, and to persuade them into that arbitrariness, which afterwards they exercised ( and the Popish party have aimed at since ; ) I will leave any *Englishman* to judge what he deserves from all lovers of their native Country. But Mr. *Hobbes*, though he hath been so violent against *Aristotle*, the Philosophers, and School-men in general, as the Authors of Sedition, yet p. 380. is as positive for *Copernicus*, and would have the Earth it self turn'd upside down in Nature, ( just as he hath been indeavouring to deal with the Policy of it ) and saith, *Navigations make it manifest*, but tells not how, and that all Learned in humane Sciences acknowledge that there are *Antipodes* ; and that Years and Days are determined by the motion of the Earth. This one now would wonder at, that a Man should affirm, that all Learned Men agree that Years and Days are determined by the motion of the Earth ; when I think, there are but few Learned Men but hold the contrary ; and I confess for this opinion could I never hear any one convincing argument. Besides, to reject an old opinion, without a better reason for a new one,

is

is difficult and strange. But this I will pass over, it being a thing plentifully discoursed in Print.

Mr. *Hobbes*, after his 47. Chapter, which is his last, and in which he hath spoken much against the Priestly being above the Kingly Office, as I think all good Protestants will admit, comes after all to a review and conclusion, (which as my Lord of *Clarendon* hath well observed, is but the poison of the whole Book suck'd into a narrower compass) and in the end of it saith, *That he hath finish'd his Discourse, without application or other design*; and so shall I mine, only referring it to the judgment of any Learned Divine, whether Mr. *Hobbes* can ever more deserve Pulpit anger, and so much credit in wickedness, as to be there stiled the *Debaucher of the Nation*; or to the judgment of any good and sober Man, whether Mr. *Hobbes* so far participates of the nature of the *Leviathan*, as to have *not his like in all the Earth*.

FINIS.